Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/lightofrussia0000dona

Patriarch Tichon

THE LIGHT OF RUSSIA

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

BY

DONALD A. LOWRIE

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

The YMCA PRESS Ltd., PRAGUE.
1923

KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
LIBRARY

281.947
L921

IN LOVING APPRECIATION OF ALL HER LIFE
HAS MEANT TO ME, THIS BOOK
IS DEDICATED TO
MY MOTHER.

48261

PREFACE.

I have endeavored in this book to make the Russian Church comprehensible to readers with no more ecclesiastical background than I had, when I began to study it six years ago. One thing everywhere needed, in interchurch as well as in international relationships, is a better understanding, and if this book can help to interpret Russian religion to Americans, I shall feel it has made some real contribution to the world-wide unity of Christians.

This statement of my purpose will explain the inclusion in the text of varied material, as well as my dwelling mainly upon externals. To go deeply into the psychology of Russian religious life, is not my intention: to do this it would require sixty rather than the six years in which I have had the opportunity of studying the subject. I have attempted to offer rather a few salient facts, than to give an exhaustive presentation; but I have endeavored to be absolutely certain of my every statement. Each chapter has passed through the hands of men who are specialists in their line. Two professors of Church history, and two Russian priests appointed by the Archbishop of North America for the purpose, have done the editorial part. As to the opinions here set forth, the collective testimony coming out of Russia in these months, from friends of the Church as well as from those indifferent or even hostile to it, tends to confirm the belief that the Church is perhaps the greatest single factor in the present Russian situation, and to justify faith in its worthiness and capacity

to lead Russian Christianity into paths of higher enlightenment. The three months I have just spent in Russia have merely deepened the convictions expressed in chapter eleven as to the vitality and capacity for progress of the Orthodox Church.

To me this book seems not so much mine as that of my friends. They have played so important a part, both in inspiring its production and in assisting its composition, that any preface must include the acknowledgement of my indebtedness. Friendship with men like Patriarch Tichon and Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden has increased my desire to contribute to that better mutual acquaintance between the Christian communions of the world, which is the first step in any movement toward unity. For guidance in the preparation of the manuscript I am chiefly indebted to Dr. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor of Christian Institutions in Union Theological Seminary, whose cyclopedic knowledge of general church history has been a test-stone of the historical portions of the book. For assistance and counsel in the sections dealing with Russian history I owe special gratitude to Rev. Leonid Turkevitch, Dean of St. Nicholas Cathedral, New York City and to the Arch-priest Nicolai Perechwalsky of the Church of Alexander Nevsky in Riga. The quotations from the Russian liturgy are taken from the sympathetic translation by Isabel Hapgood, whose "Service Book" is an indispensable guide to the study of the services of the Orthodox Church. Special gratitude is due Mrs. Helen King Gethman, for her kindness in reading proof. To the many other friends whose interest has encouraged the production of this book, I can merely offer my best "Russkoe Spaseebo".

SEVILLE, OHIO.
FEBRUARY 1922.

D. A. L.

CHAPTER OUTLINE.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.—Easter Service — Introduction	1
II.—The Separation between East and West	6
III.—Russian Christianity before the Tatars, 989—1237	37
IV.—The Russian Church under the Tatars, 1237—1461	49
V.—The Two Metropolitanates, 1461—1589	67
VI.—The Patriarchate, 1589—1700	88
VII.—The Synod, 1700—1917	107
VIII.—The Russian Church and the Russian People	126
IX.—A Sunday Morning Service: What it Means	155
X.—Beliefs and Practices of the Orthodox Church	171
XI.—The Church Since the Revolution	199

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. Early Church History (Separation of East and West).

AYER. "*Source Book for Ancient Church History*" 1913.

"*Cambridge Mediaeval History*" 1913.

DUCHESNE. "*The Churches Separated from Rome*" 1907.

FINLAY. "*History of Greece*" 1877.

FOORD. "*The Byzantine Empire*" 1911.

GARDNER. "*Theodore of Studium*" 1905.

GOETZ. "*Geschichte der Sklaven-Apostel Konstantin und Methodius*" 1897.

HARNACK. "*Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*" 1915.

HEFELE. "*Honorius und das Sechste allgemeine Concil*" 1870.

HEFELE. "*History of the Church Councils*" 1871.

HODGKIN. "*Italy and its Invaders*" vol. V. 1916.

KURTZ. "*Lehrbuch der Kirchen-Geschichte*" 1906.

MOELLER. "*Lehrbuch der Kirchen-Geschichte*" 1902.

NEANDER. "*History of the Christian Religion and of the Church*" 1872.

POPOFF. "*History of the Council of Florence*" 1861.

II. Russian History-Church and State.

a. English.

ADENEY, W. F. "*The Greek and Eastern Churches*" 1908.

FRERE, W. H. "*Links in the Chain of Russian Church History*" 1918.

HOWE, S. E. "*A Thousand Years of Russian History*" 1915.

LEROY-BEAULIEU. (Engl. Tr.) "*The Empire of the Tsars*" 1893—96.

MURAVIEFF, A. N. (Engl. Tr.) "*History of the Russian Church*" 1874.

NEALE, J. M. "*History of the Holy Eastern Church*" 1847.

RAMBAUD, A. (Engl. Tr.) "*History of Russia*" 1879.

STANLEY, A. P. "*The History of the Eastern Church*" 1861.

b. Russian.

BAZAROV. Базаровъ, «*Русская Православная Церковь*».

DOBROKLONSKY, A. P. Доброклонскій А. П., «*Руководство по Исторіи Русской Церкви*» *1889—93.*

GOLUBINSKY, E. Голубинскій Е., «*Исторія Русской Церкви*» *1900—04.*

GORCHAKOV. Горчаковъ, «*О Земельныхъ владѣніяхъ . . .*» *1871.*

KARAMZIN. Карамзинъ, «*Исторія Государства Русскаго*».

PREOBRAZENSKY, P. Преображенскій, И. «*Наша Церковь*» *1891.*

SMIRNOV. Смирновъ, «*Исторія Христіанской Православной Церкви*».

VERCHOVSKY, P. Верховскій П., «*Очерки по Исторіи русской Церкви въ 18 и 19 вѣкахъ*» *1912.*

ZNAMENSKY, P. Знаменскій П., «*Учебное Руководство по Исторіи Русской Церкви*» *1904.*

c. German.

STRAHL, Ph. "*Geschichte des Russischen Staates*" 1830.

GOETZ, L. K. "*Kirchenrechtliche und Kulturgeschichtliche Denkmaler Altrusslands*" 1905.

III. Church Doctrine and Practice.

"*The Catechism of the Orthodox Church*" 1901.

GAGARIN. "*Le Clerge Russe*" 1864.

HAPGOOD. (Eng. Tr.) "*Service Book*" 1906.

KING. "*Rites and Ceremonials of the Greek Church*" 1772.

KUROCHINSKY. (Eng. Tr.) "*The Russian Liturgy*" 1909.

KUROCHINSKY. "*О Церкви*" (About the Church) 1888.

ROMANOFF. "*Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church*" 1868.

SOKOLOFF. (Engl. Tr.) "*A Manual of the Divine Services of the Orthodox Church*" 1899.

IV. Miscellaneous.

GERRARE, W. "*Moskow*" 1903.

GRAHAM, S. "*The Way of Martha and the Way of Mary*" 1915.

GRAHAM, S. "*With the Russian Pilgrims to Jerusalem*" 1914.

HOWE, S. E. "*Some Russian Heroes, Saints and Sinners*" 1917.

POTAPENKO, J. N. "*A Russian Priest*" 1916.

MILIUKOV. Милюков, «*Очерки по Исторіи русской Культуры*» 1902.

CHAPTER I.

INTROIT.

It is the night before Easter, and we have come into the old Cathedral of the Assumption, in the heart of Moskow, for the vigil-service. The great, dim-lit room is fragrant with the odor of incense and the burning wax of scores of tapers. The walls are covered, every foot of them, with pictures of the Christian heroes and martyrs of the past. Row on row from every pillar and angle, their gold-haloed faces look down on the crowded worshippers, a sea of heads which fills every corner of the great church. And as you slowly elbow your way among them to face the sanctuary from the foot of a great pillar, the patient, expectant faces of the silent crowd rouse your imagination.

And you think of the crowds which were here last year, and a generation ago, and a century: and back and back to the days when first these walls rose, a score of years before Columbus discovered the New World. And as never before, perhaps, you feel your identity with the Church of all the centuries. The chain is linked with lives of the great and holy men of the past, these frescoed forms which crowd wall and pilaster and dome, and in the dim light, and the magic of the solemn service, they seem almost to live again, and join with the worship of the present throng. The Apostle's "cloud of witnesses" has become a new reality.

For three days the service has been almost continuous. Yesterday saw the high solemnity of the Entombment, with every worshipper holding a lighted taper, in the church, darkened to commemorate the

"darkness" which "was over all the land until the ninth hour", and the pompous setting up of the "Tomb of Christ", in the center of the church. On it was spread the purple velvet pall, embroidered with gold and jewels, and bearing a life-size picture of the dead Savior. Flowers were brought, and a goldbound copy of the Gospels was laid beside the catafalque. And all night, and all of today, the people have thronged up to kiss the pictured body of the Lord, pierced hands and feet and side, and the holy Book wherein His life is told. There have been the long lines of people waiting for confession; no light save from the hundreds of votive candles, set before various ones of the pictured saints, and in spite of the crowd of worshippers, the great church seems almost silent, with only the hushed sounds to be heard of the coming and going about the Tomb. And the dim stillness, heavy with the odor of incense, calls to mind high thoughts of Life and Death and the meaning of all the great Mystery.

It is ten o'clock. The church is almost dark, with here and there a stray reflection from the great gold and silver ikonostas, where the flicker from some candle strikes. That flash of green fire is the Tsar's emerald in the crown of the Mother of God; most of the tapers are burning before her wonder-working image, set in priceless jewels and banked with roses and narcissus. Some greybeard general has relieved the priest at the reading of the prayers, but aside from that steady drone and the shuffling feet about the Tomb, the church is still. You try to think back to the first Passion week, and to imagine His disciples on that last night, with hearts as empty as the tomb they found the next morning, talking sadly over the final service they could render Him. And you can see them stealing quietly out, in the dim dawn, to carry their spices to the grave. But how that night could ever give rise to such an occasion as this, with the gorgeous temple and the pomp of clergy and the flash of gold

and gems — all the magnificent pageantry of Candle and Cowl, is something we find it hard to understand.

Eleven o'clock, and the choir-boys, on one side of the altar in red, and on the other in deep blue, begin to take their places. A procession of priests appears not robed in the black and silver of the past week, but in something approaching the splendor of Easter, and the Winding-Sheet is carried back into the sanctuary, and the church made clear for the following service. One by one, more lights come out and row after row of the great silver chandeliers is kindled. Midnight is near, and suddenly there issues from the holy place a brilliant procession of bishops and priests, gold robes and mitres flashing diamonds, preceded by the Life-giving Cross and some richly jewelled pictures. The whole choir follows, more than a hundred boys in blue and crimson; and, all bearing candles, they go out to circle the outside of the Church, in memory of the women who went to the Tomb "while it was yet dark". There is a tense hush all through the crowded aisles, broken only by bursts of song floating in as the procession outside passes one or another of the entrances. It is as if the whole world were breathless on the threshold of some divine, mysterious portent. But I think our attitude, here, again, is different from that of the faithful ones who went to the Tomb the first Easter morning. Theirs was such a hopeless journey: we stand in vivid expectation — we *know* He is to rise, again.

With a swell of music from the choir, the glittering procession enters the great doors, and as he crosses the threshold, the Bishop exclaims "Christ is Risen", and the packed crowd sways to meet him with "He is risen, indeed". Every light in the church is lighted, every bell rings, and priests and people answer each other, many, many times: "Christ is Risen" ... "He is risen, indeed". And the choir sings it: "Christ is risen from among the dead, trampling down death

by death, and upon those in the grave bestowing life". Over and over, with ever changing music, such as only the Orthodox Church has produced, and all the while, the people repeating the salutation of the first Easter morning — "He is risen, indeed".

Then follows the great festival of rejoicing, with the beautiful prayers of adoration, and choral music which is beyond describing, until you have heard it, yourself. Could anything be sweeter than that quartet anthem of boyish voices which floats out from the sanctuary into a sudden hush in the service in the great church? There are long portions of the Gospel, notably the Prologue to John, which is read, with choir responses, in four successive tongues: Greek and Latin, Russian and Slavonic, the language of the Church. The Slavonic is thrice repeated, and all the people join at verses they know by heart, with many repetitions of the Easter greeting. Then much more litany and choral music, moving and wonderful, than which, surely, that of no other Church could be truer worship. To hear these great choirs sing, you would be sure there was an organ accompaniment somewhere, but it is only that the rest of the chorus is sustained and supported by the tremendous Russian bass. It is a great service, and you come home in the glowing dawn of four o'clock in Moskow, with all the countless belfries of her "forty times forty" churches making the air fairly throb with sound. It is Easter morning: the Lord is risen, and all the world rejoices together. Surely it never was like this, before.

Or you go to a more usual service, any Sunday morning. And again you of the West are struck with the strangeness of its beauty and devotion: the light and color, and the soaring music; the solemn chanting, and the breathless hush before the bread is made flesh, and the tears on the face of the priest as he makes confession for all the sins of his people: all the pomp and beauty and what seems the utter impracticability

of it all. Surely as sincere, as worshipful, as Christian, as any service in your church in America. And yet how strangely different from anything you have ever known, before. Where is the connection of this with our Christianity? In every recital of the liturgy, if you could understand it, you would hear the solemn prayer for "the welfare of God's holy churches and the union of them all". When were they divided, and why? How trace the history of our connection with this other half of the Christian world? The following pages are an attempt to answer our questions.

CHAPTER II.

EAST AND WEST: THEIR SEPARATION.

When the great Constantine dedicated his new capital on the Golden Horn (A. D. 330), and that complex history began, which, for sheer glamour of romance, is unsurpassed in the annals of any other city in the world, there were two separate ceremonies of consecration. The usual procedure of games, races and feasting was nothing especially novel in the world of that day. But tradition says that Constantine introduced a new element, strange to the eyes of his time, in a Christian service of dedication, pompous and solemn. We may imagine the clergy in their most splendid robing: the great processions and the impressive celebration of the "Holy Mysteries", all combining to make a picture which rivalled the most elaborate shows that paganism could produce. A few years previous, the edicts of toleration had appeared which gave legal status to Christianity throughout the whole Empire, so that now in popular favor the Christian church had overtaken the ancient gods of Greece.

The early benefits of Constantine were followed by others of increasing importance to the Church. Under the new laws it could legally hold property, so that gifts proffered it by the faithful need no longer be publicly refused. The episcopal courts were declared valid in matters pertaining to church affairs, and the clergy were exempted from the necessity of performing civil duties, as soldiers or government officials. Rich gifts were bestowed upon the Church by the Emperor, and some of the greatest edifices of the time were constructed for its worship. In his attitude toward the

increasingly important Church, Constantine exhibited, as clearly as in any other single relation, his remarkable statesmanship.

The results of all these favors were manifold. For the first time in three hundred years the Church was free from the danger of persecution. The Church throughout the Empire was very proud of the courageous martyrs whose blood had written the history of the generation just past, but now it was no longer a dangerous thing to be a Christian. On the contrary, the Church was becoming increasingly an effective gateway to popularity and especially to Imperial favor. The incubus of persecution had tended to limit the Church to the courageous, only: those whose convictions were more of moment to them than life itself, resulting in small but wonderfully-spirited Christian communities. Now the situation had altered. Instead of a repellant thing, Christianity had become a popular, not to say modish, institution, and the crowds began to flock in. And with the removal of the pressure which had so long maintained the intimate unity of the Church, and the inclusion in it of men of all races and of varying modes of thought, there was opened the way for the countless divergencies of opinion and belief, which were soon to become such important factors in Church history. The rise of the conciliar system and the ultimate separation between East and West, were more or less the result of this new world-position of the Christian Church.

If the more general marks of Imperial favor made the Church attractive to the people at large, certain other circumstances began to draw into its service the better classes of society in particular. On account of its increasing prominence, the Church's leaders soon assumed such large power and authority in the state that many of noble birth were influenced to join its communion by the chance of attaining high ecclesiastical office. The clergy were exempt from the

duties of public office also, so it came to pass that the Church under Constantine began to attract to its leadership some of the best blood, the keenest minds and the most striking characters of the time.

Thus the Church entered upon a new estate. From the despised chrysalis of the persecuted, almost furtive, band of believers of a generation past, it emerged, like a gorgeous moth, into a powerful institution, rich in worldly goods, the ascendant favorite of the State, its membership an increasing privilege instead of a mortal danger, and attracting to its leadership the greatest men of the period.

Chief among these leaders were the Bishops, one among the earliest instances of democratic authority in the Roman Empire, since they were elected by the Church membership. The early prestige of these Bishops had been strengthened during the times of persecution, when the Church's leaders were always the first to be attacked, and hence the office was held only by men of outstanding character. Still later, this authority had been greatly enhanced, actually raised to a new plane, by the development of the tremendous theory that all the truth of Christianity, for all time, had been expressed by the twelve Apostles, and that the first Bishops, believed to have been appointed by them, had handed down this authority to their successors. Thus in the Church of Constantine's day, a Bishop was already the supreme spiritual authority; the heir, by virtue of his position, of the truth and power first manifested in the Apostles. And now with the increasing wealth and state of the great organization, its episcopate assumed a place of even greater importance. In his own district, a Bishop was frequently the most influential personality, after the Emperor. Thus throughout all the Christian world, a territory greater than the Empire itself, the Church's leadership exercised an influence of the first magnitude.

Just as there was a bishop at the head of each Christian community, so there came to be, about this time, certain still higher church officials with authority over their fellows. These were the Bishops of the four great Church centers of early times, now recognized as heads of the four sections into which the Empire was divided. The cities were Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch, (Jerusalem was added, later), and their senior Bishops were known as Patriarchs. And although the question had never yet been brought seriously into dispute, it was commonly held that these Patriarchs, the supreme personages in the ecclesiastical world, possessed full independent authority, each in his own sphere. When the question of primacy came at last to be agitated, it offered additional fuel to the flame of controversy which finally burned away the bonds between East and West.

In this matter of the rise of the secular importance of the Church, cause and effect are intricately related. The favor shown it by the Emperors caused it to increase in power and influence, and its power and influence, in turn, made it the recipient of still further interest on the part of the State. The next step in the process was taken in making Catholic Christianity the official religion, (A. D. 385) and the metamorphosis from the primitive institution was complete. The Christian Church had become the dominant religious element in the world, its officials, instead of being the most persecuted, after the Emperor, the most powerful personages in the state. Now it was an arm of the government, its fate bound up with that of the Empire.

This new relationship between Church and State was to place its stamp upon the Eastern Church for all succeeding centuries. The Church of Rome, later, so far broke down the dominance of civil power as to claim superiority over it. In the East, the Church has always maintained a far closer and more cordial connection with the government. In its earlier stages, this

is nowhere better evidenced than in the circumstance connecting the Emperor with the various great councils of the Church, seven of the most notable of which occurring before 800 A. D., are known as Ecumenical. These gatherings and the results of their deliberations have exercised such a vital influence upon the life and thought of the Christian Church for more than a thousand years, and are at the same time so intricately bound up with the differences between East and West, that it is worth while briefly to examine their rise and purpose.

Although Constantine had been head of the Roman Empire, the capital which he created was essentially Greek. The art treasures of all the world were drawn upon to produce a city of oriental magnificence. And the court which was its heart was of a luxury and state which marked a vast change from the stern simplicity of Rome. In this city the West met the East, and the influence of the latter so completely absorbed that of the ancient capital as almost to extinguish it. Here was a great university; here were schools of philosophers; the speculative, oriental atmosphere which the Church of the East has preserved down to our day, was already a marked characteristic of the city. The language of the people, as well as of the court, was Greek. The mode of thought and the ideals of life were so completely Hellenic they almost obscured the Roman element.

Thus Christianity, centering in the new capital, came very naturally into touch with various groups, national and racial, whose ideas inevitably affected its thought for all the future. It was an age of speculation, and soon there began to be found within the official list of the Christian Church, sundry groups of thinkers whose doctrines differed in essential particulars from other and older parties. Disputes of increasing violence arose. At first, such matters were easily settled by virtue of the principle that the Bishop

was the repository of the truth, and his decision fixed what must be believed. But the situation became complicated when it fell out that sometimes the Bishops of adjoining dioceses did not agree among themselves. Here was a parlous state of affairs. Either the principle that each Bishop was divinely inheritor of the truth vested in the Apostles was wrong, or something was the matter with one of the men calling himself Bishop. After a few such experiences, it became customary for the Bishops in a given region to consult each other and announce a common decision upon disputed points. The wide travel and easy communication open to the peoples in the Roman Empire, however, soon made it necessary for this idea of consultation between Bishops to be expanded to its next logical step. Whole sections of the Christian world were united against other sections, in hot disputings about points of belief, and the Church which Constantine had visualized as a cohesive force in his Empire, threatened, instead, to split it up. Something must be done to mend the situation, and Constantine did it. He issued a call for a meeting of representatives of all the Christians of the whole world, and in A. D. 325 there assembled in Nicea the first General, or Ecumenical Council.

In the four hundred years following the first council at Nicea, six other councils were held, in which the Church, both East and West, participated. These bear the title Ecumenical, (General), and are recognized as authoritative by both halves of Christendom. They are the Councils of Constantinople, 381, Ephesus, 431, Chalcedon, 451, Constantinople, 553, Constantinople, 680, and Nicea, 787. This second council of Nicea was the last General Council before the political division of the Empire, and although both Eastern and Western representatives participated in later conferences, it is the last whose authority is fully recognized throughout the Christian world. Since 787 Rome has held numerous councils whose decisions she claims are binding

upon all Christendom. There have been later councils in the East, as well, but the Eastern Church holds that because they did not represent all the Christian world, these later assemblies have only minor significance, and until another real ecumenical council can be held, composed of delegates from all the Christian churches in the world, there can be no fundamental alteration in church doctrine.

These seven councils were all similar in composition and mode of operation. The Emperor usually summoned a general council, and was present in person or by his representative. The decisions of the councils, while not openly influenced by the monarch, were generally presented for his official approval and their consequent promulgation throughout the Empire was as much a matter of civil, as of ecclesiastical authority. As time went on, the councils became more and more a meeting-place for representatives of the varying political tendencies of the Empire as well as of its different shades of dogmatic belief.

These representatives were primarily the Bishops of the churches of the Empire. An Ecumenical Council meant that, at the call of the Emperor, the episcopate of the whole Church had been summoned to assemble in a given place. While there always were a great number of lesser lights, attendant upon the prelates, and even sometimes participating in the discussions of the councils, the voting was done solely by the Bishops and the solemn and universal decrees bore only their signatures, or those of their accredited delegates. As they were the living repository of Apostolic truth, their decisions as to what the Christians of their day should believe were final: there could be no higher appeal.

These decisions bore very largely upon points of doctrine, a circumstance intimately connected with the ultimate break between East and West. The philosophical East was supremely concerned with

holding to the right belief, which explains the fact that these most widely representative gatherings in all of Christian history should have been occupied with vague and, to us moderns, well-nigh meaningless distinctions of dogma. In consequence of the distinctly eastern tone of these councils the primary emphasis was placed on what it was necessary for a Christian to believe, rather than on what it was fitting for him to do.

This emphasis has persisted throughout Christendom in general, but more definitely in its eastern than in its western portions. Even in the centuries when all sections of the Christian world were still participating in the great Councils, this difference was evident. Rome, the chief representative of what was later to be the Church of the West, sent her delegates to these Councils and participated in their decisions, but it was more in the role of an umpire, looking on, (later, she sought to change this attitude, for that of a specially appointed mediator), than as an active participant in the sometimes very heated discussions. Philosophical niceties concerned Rome far less than they did the people of the East. She was already more insistent upon the legal side of her church discipline.

This difference in attitude toward dogmatic controversy was but one of the distinctions between Rome and the seats of the other Patriarchates. Many other factors combined to give Rome a separate importance and eventually a higher position than was possessed by the other great centers of Christianity. In the first place, it was the ancient capital of the Empire. The whole world had long connected the Roman name with the idea of power and authority which was not dispelled even by the removal of the capital to a new city destined to surpass it in wealth and magnificence. In fact, Rome's isolation after the removal of the capital was a significant factor in the subsequent division of both the Church and the Empire. She was left with-

out a political rival in all the West. Her position in the world of diplomacy was now comparable to that which had long been hers in the eyes of all the Church.

From earliest times, Rome had been an important center of Christianity. This was probably due, in the first instance, to the fact that it was the most populous city in the Empire as well as its capital, and hence the largest body of Christians was there collected together. But as the greatest of the early Christian churches and immediately in the eye of the Roman government, the Christian community at the capital was the most prominent sufferer in the persecutions of the second and third centuries. Its fame spread through all the world as the church of the most glorious martyrs. With the possible exception of the African churches, no other community could rival its lists of those who had laid down their lives for the faith. Here were preserved the relics of those holy martyrs, including the bones of two of the greatest apostles, both of whom were believed to have aided in the early establishment of the Church. By the fourth century, pilgrimages from all parts of the Empire had begun to center on Rome, the holiest of Christian cities, the city of Peter and Paul.

The common belief that two of the apostles had not only been concerned with the founding of its church but that their bodies reposed within its walls, was, *per se* an indication of Rome's superiority. Other churches in the world believed they could trace their origin to one or another of the apostles; Rome claimed not one but two, and two of the greatest. Alexandria, the only church of the East which ever approached the position of Rome, had been founded, so tradition had it, by Mark, a mere pupil of the great Peter. Thus early in Christian history, before the period of the wide controversies and their attendant councils, the Church at Rome already held by common consent a reputation for sanctity somewhat above that of any other Christian center.

Then when the great doctrinal disputes arose, the Roman Church's attitude toward them emphasized the already existing distinction between it and other churches in the Empire. The West was never so acutely concerned with differences of opinion about dogma and theology as were the churches of the East. Alexandria could rage in controversy against Antioch or Constantinople; Rome was rarely deeply concerned, and held herself separate from the heated discussions. And this very aloofness served to increase the prestige of the Roman Church. Occupying, as it did in controversial times and at the great Councils more or less the position of a disinterested spectator, Rome came frequently to be asked to serve as umpire. The decrees of one great council, that of Sardica, actually mention Rome as the party to which disputes between Eastern churches may be referred if it is so desired. It is not long until we find various leading churchmen of the East who claimed they had been wronged in their own sections of the world, appealing to Rome as to a court of arbitration, for justice and judgment.

An appeal to the Church of Rome meant an appeal to its Bishop. As the head of this greatest church of the early Christian centuries, sanctified by the blood of the martyrs, the Bishop of Rome already held a peculiar place in the mind of the Christian world. This had been the post of greatest danger in the years of persecution, and the spiritual prestige of the Roman episcopate increased with the growing reputation of the city for especial sanctity and spiritual importance. It is here to be noted that the substance of the claims of all the popes rests upon the superiority of the Roman See — the Church of St. Peter — rather than upon the personality at the head of that Church. Thus before the time of Constantine the Bishop of Rome was one of the leading figures in the Christian world.

After Constantine had moved his capital and the seat of civil authority to the East, the Bishop of

Rome rapidly became the most prominent and authoritative personage remaining in the West. As the centuries moved on, and as he assumed for his chair larger and larger spiritual authority, the position of Roman pontiff came to be the first in the Western half of the Empire. This position was enhanced by various historic events. It was a Bishop of Rome, we are told, who in 452 prevented the approach to the city of the hordes of Attila, and later, although he did not succeed in preventing their entrance, obtained the exemption of the city from destruction by the barbarians under Gaiseric. As newer sections of the Empire became Christian, the Bishop of Rome assumed the position of director of their affairs, and Spain and Britain owe much of their early Christian organization to Pope Gregory the Great, (590—604). Still later, when the Emperor at Constantinople had become so distant and impotent a personage that appeals to him for help against threat of invasion were useless, the Bishop of Rome took the epochal step of allying himself with a western power, separate from, and independent of, the Empire of the East. The importance of this act in its relation to the separation of East and West will appear later.

All through these centuries when the place of the Bishop of Rome was becoming politically more and more important, there is traceable at the same time a steady growth in the spiritual authority, claimed or actually exercised, by the occupant of Peter's chair. Even in earlier times, when each of the great church centers asserted its establishment by one of the Apostles, the tradition of Rome as the foundation of St. Peter gave its bishop an implied primacy among equals. When the theory of the apostolic succession for all bishops came to be generally accepted, the Bishop of Rome still retained a peculiar importance as the successor of Peter, always regarded as the chief of the Twelve Apostles. Although the sweeping claims

based upon it came only centuries later, still this supposed succession aided in establishing the earlier basis of spiritual authority for the Roman primate, a position which was made the foundation for the cumulative steps, now to be traced, by which the Bishops of Rome laid claim to steadily broadening spiritual power.

At the beginning of this series of steps in the process of becoming the supreme spiritual authority in at least a part of the Christian Church, it is well to note that to claim authority is not always to exercise it. Of the successive assertions by different Roman primates of their right to this or that broadened spiritual dominion some remained mere unsubstantial claims, with no real authority resulting from them. On the other hand, it is significant that many of these claims, at first without tangible result, eventually saw their fulfillment in actuality as the Bishops of Rome held fast to their contention; sheer persistence conquered opposition.

As early as the end of the second century a Bishop of Rome had assumed the right to excommunicate certain of the clergy of other churches who did not agree with him upon the question of the proper date for the celebration of Easter. After much discussion, the date-machinery favored by this Bishop was approved by a council. A little later, a Bishop of Rome took it upon himself to issue laws which he claimed were of equal weight with those made by great councils. A few decades further on, Innocent I (402—417) added to this claim of legislative power the enlarged pretense to judicial authority throughout the Christian Church. This he based upon a reading of the records of an early council (Sardica) which suggested that disputes between Eastern churches might be referred to the Bishop of Rome as a disinterested umpire. He interpreted this to mean that such disputes must be referred to him, and here was prominently introduced

for the first time the claim for supreme spiritual authority over other bishops. In order to give weight to this claim, founded primarily upon a technicality in conciliar records, Leo I (440—461) brought in the argument, already become important, that the Bishop of Rome was originally consecrated by Peter, chief of the Apostles, and therefore entitled to spiritual primacy.

The theory of Petrine supremacy as it gradually developed, formulates itself about as follows: one of the utterances of Jesus, reported in the Gospel, gave basis for a claim that Peter was especially singled out as the head of the Christian Church. This had been tacitly accepted by earlier Bishops of Rome, where Peter was believed to have founded the Church and begun the episcopal succession. Somewhat the same feeling doubtless existed in the Christian Church throughout the Empire. Now Leo took this theory, already emphasized by one of his predecessors, and added to it the conscious claim to supreme spiritual power. Salvation, he asserted, came not through all the Apostles but through Peter alone. Therefore the line of his succession, the Bishops of Rome, are the primary source of saving truth and to appropriate the virtue inherent in the Church, he who would be saved must be in communion with the Church headed by the Bishop of Rome. In Constantinople, the peculiar connection between Church and State gave the Emperor such influence in ecclesiastical affairs that he was practically the final authority. Now the Bishop of Rome declared that in spiritual matters, at least, he was superior even to the Emperor. Another circumstance of the time added prestige to the office of the Roman primate. At the Council of Chalcedon in 451 it was the doctrine of the two natures of Christ incorporated in Leo's "Tome" which received the authentication of the assemblage. Between claims to power and actually recognized authority, then, the Roman

episcopate by the end of the fifth century had become a force to be reckoned with in the affairs of the Empire.

This importance of Rome soon manifested itself. The edict of the Emperor Zeno regarding the dispute over the nature of Christ attempted to set aside Leo's "Tome", whereupon the Bishop of Rome excommunicated the Imperial adviser, Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople. The whole of the Eastern church supported the Constantinopolitan Bishop, and for thirty-five years Constantinople and Rome were separate, in an ecclesiastical sense. A paper reconciliation followed, which was so unsatisfactory that in order to restore unity the Emperor Justinian forced the unwilling Bishop of Rome to condemn certain chapters in the writings of men whom the Council of Chalcedon had reckoned orthodox. In this instance the Emperor maintains his authority over the Roman pontiff. Later, there are uncertain pictures of the Bishops of Rome. We see them appointed by the civil representatives of the Emperor, residing in Ravenna, an evidence of the temporary revival of Byzantine power in the West. Then again there is a decline in the prosperity of the Empire and the hordes of Islam threaten to overwhelm it entirely. And this sets the stage for the next great controversy which racked Christendom.

In 717, Constantinople had been saved from a most formidable Moslem attack, thus far the greatest peril in its history, and the Emperor, Leo the Isaurian, its deliverer, set himself about restoring his realm to better order. He found that Christianity as well as the civil affairs of the Empire had fallen on evil days. Ignorance and superstition combined with a lowered standard of life had reached such a stage that the rise of Mohammedanism actually seemed to many Christians to offer a religion higher and better than their own. Against this state of affairs Leo, supported by the military power of the Empire, set his hand. The most striking move in the direction of reform was the edict forbidding

the worship of holy images, followed later by a proclamation ordering their removal from churches and other places of honor. The practice of the veneration of holy pictures and the belief in their wonder-working powers was so widespread and so vital a part of the lives of Christians in general, that only the most urgent need could have impelled the Emperor to interfere with it.

But there was apparently urgent need; let it be admitted at the outset that while the moral values involved were doubtless of serious moment, still this need was embodied as largely in the political as in the ecclesiastical situation. Islam had become a dangerous rival, political as well as religious. One of its vaunted points of superiority over Christianity was its hatred of idolatry, and Mohammedans observing the abject devotion paid to pictures and statues in Christian communities, had a certain right to claim superiority for the faith of the Prophet. To remove this reproach Leo naturally desired to take some action.

An internal situation, as well, involved Leo in the dispute over image-worship. His Empire was divided between two political parties: the military caste, supporting the Emperor, and the clerical element, led by the monks. On account of their exemption from military service, the churchmen had long been unpopular with the other party. But the clergy, by virtue of their support of the worship of images had managed to retain the adherence of the people at large, and hence the balance of power, so that this doctrine formed the central point of attack when finally the Emperor's party ventured to challenge clerical prestige.

In 726 the famous decrees against image-worship appeared, soon followed by an edict removing, from accessibility at least, all pictures or statues, objects of veneration. The people were violent in their protests. Rioting occurred. The order extended throughout the Empire, and everywhere, save in Asia Minor, the

Church rose against it. In Italy, this defense of old custom was led by Pope Gregory III who published letters denouncing the Emperor as a heretic. The tension between Rome and Constantinople was so patent that the Lombards from North Italy were emboldened to overrun almost all the Peninsula. The Pope had to call upon the Franks for help. The Emperor in Constantinople threatened to confiscate the papal estates and the thread of connection between Rome and the East became yet more tenuous. Although as yet the Bishop of Rome still recognized the Emperor as official head of the State, the curtain had risen on the last act of the drama of a Western Empire controlled from Constantinople.

The controversy over image-worship continued for a century and a half, long after it had ceased to be of prime political importance. One or two of its incidents, however, are still pertinent to our study. In an effort to get support for his position, Leo's son, Constantine V, called a council which solemnly pronounced anathema upon the principal champions of the veneration of ikons. As the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria refused to attend, and the Pope issued an anathema against this assemblage, its decisions were not widely effective. The Emperor's decree was obeyed at least in his own city, however, and in parts of Asia Minor.

But times and rulers change and within a generation there appeared on the throne a woman destined to "a terrible celebrity in history, and an undeserved reputation for sanctity", in the later church. The Empress Irene, before her marriage a famous Greek beauty, favored the forbidden practices and under her influence the iconoclastic clergy were replaced by men known to be supporters of image-worship. Soon she called a great council, avowedly for the purpose of restoring legality to the use of pictures in the church. The meeting of this council at Nicea in 787 is almost

the last assemblage of representatives of the Christians of both East and West. The envoys of the three Eastern Patriarchs were in attendance. The Bishop of Rome, consenting to a council to reverse the decisions of the iconoclasts, sent his delegates with important letters. And the Council did what it was intended to: the propriety of reverencing images (not statues, but pictures) was affirmed, with the important corollary that the respect paid to pictures or any other earthly object or person is a different attitude from the worship due to God alone. The decrees were proclaimed with great ceremony in the presence of the Empress and her son, and later received the sanction of the Pope. The Church throughout all the world was again united, in the last great Council recognized as authoritative by both East and West.

The next severance of relations between the two halves of Christendom, however, followed within thirteen years from this Nicene Council. In a political sense, the division was final; ecclesiastically, there were reunions and schisms yet to come. Constantinople was so busied with plots and counter-plots about the throne, combined with ever-threatening invasion by Bulgars from the North and Saracens from East and South, that, as we have already noted, Italy had become decidedly a second consideration. To protect themselves from invasions of the Lombards, the Bishops of Rome had entered into increasingly intimate relationships with the Franks whose great leader, now, was Charles the Great. Charles had already built a powerful empire in the West, extending his conquest into Spain and Gaul and Italy, where he had become a champion of the Pope and of ascendant importance in Italian affairs.

But this does not mean that the Pope had ceased to regard the Byzantine Emperor as his superior. Though it was shortly to cease to be the custom, still all the documents of the Bishops of Rome, up to this

time, recognized the Imperial authority. Just now, however, the throne in Constantinople was occupied by a woman, a fact which gave some technical basis for the future course of events. The Empress Irene, thinking perhaps to strengthen her feeble connection with the West, arranged the betrothal of her son with the daughter of Charles the Great. Just how large a part her sudden rupture of this agreement, a few years later, had in shaping Charles' feeling of hostility to the East, we cannot tell, but there now followed a succession of events closing the story of secular connection between the East and what was to be the Western Empire.

In response to the pleadings of the Pope, Charles came to Italy and subdued the Lombard power, confirming the Pope (774) in the territories granted by his father, Pepin. He thus established the temporal power of the papacy, but at the same time constituted himself its patron. When, on Christmas day, 800, Leo crowned him Emperor, Charles was recognized as the successor to the eastern Caesars, whose throne, it was alleged, was vacant, being occupied by a woman, in the person of Irene.

There was no doubt as to which of the two great political centers it was wisest for Rome to be allied with. Constantinople was far away and, even if interested, powerless to be a large factor in Western Europe. In the West Charles was already the greatest ruler which the recent centuries had seen; his power was on the ascendant; he ruled all of Italy not embraced in the Papal Estates; he was the defender of the Popes. But, as defender of the Popes, Charles acted as a Roman Emperor in Constantinople would have done. Even before the coronation he had espoused the cause of those who denied the validity of image-worship, in opposition to the Popes, themselves.

Henceforth Constantinople had no political authority in Western Europe. Fourteen years later the Byzantine Emperor officially recognized the indepen-

dence of the Empire of the West, and another stage was complete, in the final separation of the Church.

Now Rome was independent, politically, from Constantinople. That there was no separation in ecclesiastical affairs is evidenced by the next great controversy of which history tells us. In 858 Caesar Bardas, an uncle of the Emperor in Constantinople, impelled largely by political reasons, deposed the Patriarch Ignatius and appointed in his place the leader of the intellectual laity of the time, a man named Photius. The case of the deposed prelate soon came to the attention of the historic umpire in church disputes and a long letter from Ignatius reached the Pope, Nicholas I. The Pope decided to sustain the contention of the petitioner, and in two different synods held at Rome Ignatius was pronounced the rightful occupant of the Patriarchal chair and Photius declared a usurper. Photius, however, was not the man to allow such action to go unchallenged. He replied to the Pope in the "Encyclical to the Oriental Patriarchs", published in 866. It was a masterly document, especially notable for our purpose on account of its careful exposition of the ritual and dogmatic differences between the Roman Church and the Churches of the East. This is the first prominent public recognition of vital differences between East and West. Photius followed it with a call for a church council. It met, the next year, in Constantinople, and, considering the matter of these differences, declared the Roman pontiff heretical on several counts and ordered him deposed and excommunicated. Once again Rome was cut off from the rest of Christendom, and this time not merely upon the basis of a present quarrel but because of certain gravely-considered matters in which her dogma and ritual differed from that of the East.

The most significant of these disputed points centered upon a single Latin word which came, later, to be the crucial factor in the permanent break be-

tween the two halves of Christendom. "They have gone to the extreme limit of evil", says Photius, "and have altered the Creed by introducing 'Filioque'! They thus impute two principles (of development) to the Holy Trinity". And when Photius wrote "Filioque" he was putting his finger on an already sore spot in the relations between East and West. The difficulty had had its origin in Spain, three hundred years before.

When the Arian Spaniards were considering entrance into the Catholic Church (A. D. 589), one of the questions chiefly under discussion was whether it was right to say in the "Gloria": "To the Father and to the Son" as all the Orthodox Church did, or to sing, "To the Father, through the Son", as had long been the custom in Spain. The Church insisted upon the old form, and the Spaniards agreed. Soon after, we find them reciting the century-old Constantinopolitan Creed with an added word, "Filioque", in the clause about the origin of the Holy Spirit. In an attempt to emphasize their true orthodoxy, apparently, they have inserted this word which joins to that part of the Creed "the Holy Spirit which proceedeth from the Father", the additional phrase, "and from the Son". Now this was a matter of little moment to the Church at Rome, for the Creed was more a part of their Church records than of its service and it was not commonly recited in the Liturgy, as was the case in the East. So the adoption of the Creed with the word "Filioque" in it, first in Spain, later in Britain and then by the Franks, was almost an accident. The West failed to regard it as an important point.

Not so the East. For generations the Creed of Constantinople had been an integral part of the Liturgy and the General Council of Ephesus had pronounced anathema upon anyone who should presume to alter it in the least detail. The Western innovation came first to the attention of the East in a dispute

between Greek and Frankish monks in Jerusalem. The Franks sang the Creed with the "Filioque" and the Greeks raised a vehement protest. It came later to the ears of Charles the Great, who called a council at Aachen at which the contention of the East was given scant consideration, and the use of the "Filioque" was officially approved for the Franks. The Bishop of Rome seems to have taken no important part either in this decision or in its fulfillment, but to the whole Eastern Church this unpardonable alteration in the holy Creed was a count against the orthodoxy of all the Church of the West.

Photius, then, in 866, emphasizing the "Filioque" together with other differences between Rome and Constantinople, succeeded in completing the break between the two Churches. A reconciliation with his former opponent, Ignatius, and the restoration of peace in the Church at home, however, brought about a resumption of intercourse between the Pope and the Eastern Patriarchs. This reconciliation, based as it was upon negotiations in which neither side fully accepted the contentions of the other, had in it the seed of future trouble, and for nearly two hundred years we have a checkered history of amity and enmity, of paper unions and formal separations, between East and West.

This twilight zone of relationships persists up to the controversy between Pope Leo IX (1049–1054) and Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople. The Pope was becoming so powerful a personage that the former tolerance of Greek rites and customs in South Italy was threatened, and the Byzantine Emperor sought to create a diversion. Under his instruction the Patriarch, in conjunction with the Metropolitan of Bulgaria, arranged for the closing of Latin churches in the East and issued a letter containing a violent attack upon the whole Roman Church. A curious feature of this sudden sally is the introduction of a complaint against the Latin custom of using unleavened bread for the celebration of the

Eucharist, to which point such prominence is given as to obscure for a time even the old "Filioque" dispute.

To this attack the ablest theologians of the West replied and the feeling on both sides was very bitter. The competition between the two Churches for ecclesiastical supremacy over the Slavs, indicated in the secrecy of the agreement of Cerularius with the Bulgarian Metropolitan, was another contributing factor in preventing the success of attempted reconciliation. In 1054 a delegation of three prominent churchmen from Rome visited Constantinople. The controversy here reached its height. Hot denunciations written by Eastern clergy were met by equally violent replies from the pens of the Roman legates, and at last seeing the hopelessness of the situation, they formally deposited upon the high altar of St. Sophia a solemn condemnation of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch and all who agreed with him. This is the final act. Since that day there has never been a real union between the Churches of East and West.

In passing, we may note two conspicuous attempts formally to reunite Rome with the Churches of the East: the first in 1274 at the Council of Lyons, and the other in the Council of Florence, 1437. They serve only to demonstrate how deep-seated the difficulty was. In spite of the most powerful pressure, political and economic, exerted upon delegates of these Councils, the actual progress toward reunion was nil. Even when a paper reunion was forced from the worn-out delegates at Florence after a wrangling parley lasting over a year, it was repudiated in no uncertain terms by the peoples of the Eastern Churches, even so far away as Moskow. And here, as in older controversies, the "Filioque" clause, the last point on which the Greek delegates conceded their agreement, was the first to be challenged by the peoples and the majority of the clergy of the East. They would have none of it. The ancient Creed must not be altered. One single word

became a wall of separation. East and West had broken, completely. Reunion is still in our own day, a matter of dim future possibility.

There remains to be discussed but one other factor pertinent to our study of this final separation. It has already been hinted at in the mention of Michael Cerularius and his collusion with the Bulgarian Metropolitan. The Eastern adherence of the Bulgars was one instance of a larger controversy, represented in the earlier conflicting claims of Rome and Constantinople to ecclesiastical control over the various Slavonic races. For some time after the conversion in 863 of a Bulgar prince and the confusion resulting from his attempt to force Christianity upon his people, there was considerable uncertainty as to the ecclesiastical allegiance of the Bulgarian nation. After vaccillating for some time between Rome and Constantinople, however, the Bulgars decided to cast in their lot with the latter, thus setting a precedent for the other Slavic peoples as yet unconverted to Christianity.

The two great names which stand out in the history of the conversion of the Slavs are Cyril and Methodius, sons of a well-known official family of Constantinople. They received the usual classical education of the time, but both seem to have chosen the monastic life rather than an official career. They first come into prominence when they are sent by the Emperor on a mission to the Khazars, a nation inhabiting the Crimea and the Don basin. Among other accomplishments of this time, the brothers are said to have mastered the Slavonic language. Just how long they stayed here, we do not know, but the chroniclers tell us of the complete triumph of Christianity over the concurrent religions, Judaism and Islam, and finally of the return of the missionaries to Constantinople.

Shortly after this the two brothers were again sent out by the Emperor, this time on a mission to the Moravians whose Prince, we are told, having heard

of their success among the Khazars had asked to have a similar expedition for his people. The lives and methods of work of these two apostles to the Slavs cannot be too strongly emphasized as examples of the highest type of missionary effort. There seems to have been a division of labor between the two brothers, Cyril undertaking the more clearly executive part of the work and Methodius the teaching and cultural side, a part of the labor among the Moravians which deserves especial notice. The brother missionaries, finding the Slavonic peoples at a considerably lower cultural level than that of their own country, immediately set about the task not merely of giving them the true faith, but of imparting as much as possible of all the other phases of a higher civilization. We read of schools for children, of improved agricultural methods, of Cyril's wise counsels in the betterment of civil government. Nowhere is this breadth of mind and the missionaries' capacity for adapting themselves to serving these backward people, better evidenced, than in their translation of the service-books of the Church into the Slavonic tongue.

Cyril and Methodius found the Moravians speaking an unwritten language, and immediately set about the production of an alphabet for the purpose of transcribing it. Using the Greek and another very old alphabet called the Glagolitic, they produced a series of characters which has been the basis of the writing of most Slavic peoples ever since. In it they wrote down the liturgy of the Orthodox Church and parts of the New Testament. The Church of the West had long held that the Liturgy could properly be celebrated only in one of the three tongues used in the inscription on the Cross on Golgotha: Greek, Latin and Hebrew. Now there was introduced to a large portion of Southeastern Europe the use of the church service in the speech of the local population. This circumstance brought the two missionaries into contact with Rome.

At this period (868) there was still official harmony between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, but the difficulty over the allegiance of the Bulgars had heightened the feeling of competition for spiritual control over other Slavic peoples then in the process of conversion, so that Cyril and Methodius soon found themselves in contact with Teutonic clerics in communion with Rome, also working among the Moravians. The jealousy of these German missionaries soon expressed itself in a complaint to the Pope that Cyril and Methodius were violating the principles of the Church in the use of the Slavonic tongue for the Liturgy. The Pope asked the two Greeks to come to Rome for a conference.

Aside from their earnest personalities they were powerfully assisted into the good graces of the Pope by the fact that they brought with them the body of the holy and martyred St. Clement, which they had discovered several years previously, during their stay in Kherson at the time of the mission to the Khazars. And with this introduction the Constantinopolitan missionaries apparently made good their case with the Roman Pontiff, for Methodius, (Cyril having died in Rome), returned to his great work in Moravia with official permission to use the language of the people in the Church service. But the German bishops would not be content. Methodius was seized and imprisoned. The next ten years had a confused story of successive accusations by the Germans, of both sanction and ban on the use of the Slavonic Liturgy by different Popes, and much difficulty to the sturdy Methodius whose work had to be interrupted by several trips to Rome. In spite of all obstruction, however, Methodius continued steadfastly at his task of Christianizing the Slavic peoples, working in Moravia and adjoining territories until 882 when the opposition of the German Catholics became so threatening that he was compelled to flee to Constantinople. Here he labored until his

death three years later, accomplishing a prodigious amount of translation and other literary work. His work alone, we are told, is responsible for the production of practically the whole Bible in Slavonic.

There are few saints who lived as late as the dawn of the tenth century to whom honor is done by both the Church of Rome and the Churches of the East, but among these surely none more clearly deserve remembrance by all the Christian world than Cyril and Methodius. To their labors as to none other is due the Christianization of the great Slavic branch of the European peoples; the wisdom and adaptability they exhibited in their work may be studied with real profit by the missions of our own day. Their production of a sacred literature in the Slavonic tongue was of the widest consequence; their accomplishments in the spread of the Gospel made it possible, when all the rest of the East was overrun by the hordes of Islam, that one sovereign representative of the Eastern Church should exist, independent of Mohammedan supremacy. The national Church of Russia was alone outside Turkish dominion.

About the time of Cyril and Methodius, Christian missionaries had entered Kiev, and as we take up the consideration of Russia as a Christian power, we may pause long enough to glance at the sort of Christianity it received. What were the characteristics of the religion Constantinople of the tenth century had to give to Russia?

When the worship of images was restored in a council directed by the Empress Theodora, in 847, she decreed an annual festival to be known as Orthodoxy Sunday. The old beliefs had triumphed, and in every Church of the East to this day the first Sunday in Lent is celebrated as a holiday of the Church's restoration to the true faith. A few years earlier a great Eastern theologian, the fiery John of Damascus, had first brought into prominence the use of this particular

word; the Church of the East must be orthodox: "right-believing". And orthodox it has remained, down through all the centuries since. We have seen how concerned the Eastern Church had always been over the emphasis in religion on a creed. To know what you must believe: that was the most absorbing interest in Constantinople. And that belief was fixed unchangeably by the seven great councils. To this day the Eastern Church holds their decisions as final and unalterable in matters of dogma and doctrine. Until all Christendom is again united, and a truly Ecumenical Council can be assembled, there can be no changes in the basis of belief and teaching. It is also significant that the period closing with the Christianization of the South Russians was the time in which not only the doctrine of the Church was crystallized into permanent form, but also its ceremonial and Liturgy. While there were general councils, there was opportunity for more or less elasticity of service-ritual. Once the councils ceased, however, a marked tendency is noticeable to wish the preservation of Church service and mechanism as unchanged as the Creed. The Church of the East gave to the Slavs an orthodox faith, with the solemn injunction to preserve sacred and unaltered the beliefs and practice and liturgy of the Seven Councils.

Another item to be considered here is the relationship in Constantinople of Church and State. At the time of which we speak (989) Constantinople was almost at the crest of a wave of power and prosperity. The lavish magnificence of the court is almost past believing. The Emperor in Constantinople reigned over territory much greater than anything the Eastern Empire had known in a century. There was nominal peace on most of its borders, and Constantinople sat down to enjoy its leisure. But idleness was not conducive to high morality, so that general cultural standards failed to rise with the prosperity of the Empire. The Church was not untouched by the prevailing in-

fluence: it was a part of the governmental machine and naturally overshadowed by the Emperor. It mirrored the prevalent attitude; its services were of the most elaborate and gorgeous form and there was a notable tendency to be content with ecclesiastical formalism, so long as it did not depart from the rituals handed down from of old, without special concern as to the moral values behind it. But though the spirit of worship was somewhat lacking, its forms were unequalled for magnificence. Let the envoys sent by a Russian prince to witness the service in St. Sophia speak concerning its richness: "When we stood in the temple we did not know where we were, for there is nothing else like it upon earth. There in truth God has His dwelling with men, and we can never forget the beauty we saw there". So, in form, the Church kept pace with the Empire.

The government was also a very prominent factor in the official life of the church. Emperors made and unmade Patriarchs: one of them even tried to enforce his ruling that no Church official should be promoted or changed from place to place without Imperial consent. We should fail to comprehend the subsequent history of the Church of the East, especially in Russia, did we not appreciate the intimate relation between organized Christianity and the State: between the Emperor and the Church.

Nor must it be forgotten that this whole civilization as well as its form of Christianity was Greek. Its literati prided themselves upon their inheritance of the culture of Athens and rather despised the rudeness of the Italian capital. From the founding of the city on the Bosphorus, Constantinople and Rome had parallelled, and to a large extent continued, the relationship existing in primitive times between Paul and the Christians at Jerusalem. The Church at Rome had a legalistic viewpoint very similar to the zeal of the early Hebrew Christians for their Talmud, while the

Greeks were always far more interested in the doctrinal side of religion. To Rome, Christianity was a law to be kept: to Constantinople it was a philosophy to be comprehended. As we have seen in the story of the councils, what could arouse tempestuous concern in the East was a discussion as to the nature of God or the person of Christ. Rome, on the other hand, following her great prototype, the early Empire, was busied with the making and enforcement of law. The East speculated: how could there be two natures in the one person of Christ — how explain the phenomenon, metaphysically? The councils of the West disputed the legality of baptism or the sacraments, if administered by properly appointed, but not always morally valid officials. To Constantinople the fundamental thing was theology; to Rome, authority.

This, then, is the type of religion that Constantinople has to pass on to the Slavs — of the East, eastern, Orthodox, mainly concerned with the retention of the faith of the fathers, while Catholic Rome is chiefly anxious for the acquisition of new authority through the adaption of old truths to new situations. It is Greek instead of Latin, with the emphasis upon the theological, rather than the legalistic side of religion. The Eastern Church to this day knows as the "Holy Mysteries" what we of the West call by the more judicial phrase the "Ordinance of the Sacraments". As Stephen Graham puts it, the Church of the East represents the "Way of Mary" over against the "Way of Martha". The eastern emphasis is upon devotion rather than doing, worship before work, the contemplative side of religion, rather than the too often over-emphasized action of the Christianity of the modern West.

Now it is evident why a study of this process of separation between the Churches of East and West must begin with the dedication of Constantinople, in 330. The foundation of an eastern capital was the initial step toward dividing first the Empire and then

the Church into two separate parts, because from its new metropolis the Church derived that interest in philosophical theory which brought about the Seven Councils, gatherings in whose discussions Rome soon assumed the position of spectator rather than participant with the other four great Church centers. Basing his claims upon what he thought were the decrees of one of these councils, a Bishop of Rome put forth the first of a cumulative series of claims to superior authority, political as well as spiritual, over all Christendom, claims which grew through five centuries until at length, after one Roman Pontiff had caused the political division of the Empire into East and West (A. D. 800), another was excommunicated by Photius in the dispute over the Filioque clause in the Creed (866). Reunions and new separations followed, closing with the mutual excommunications of Roman Pope and Constantinopolitan Patriarch, in 1054, a breach which sporadic efforts through four centuries failed to heal, and which persists to our own time.

That the disparity between Eastern and Western Christianity was more than a mere quibble over the wording of a creed has been evident throughout these pages. Fundamentally, the great difference was one of temperament. To the East religion was a revelation; a philosophy to be comprehended. To the West, best represented by Rome, it was a system of laws to be obeyed. Right belief, Orthodoxy: that was the chief interest of the East. The fulfillment of a code of laws — the church as a society of redeemed persons — Catholicity: these ideas filled the horizon of the Western Church. The East combined deep reverence for the unalterable creed with a certain laxness toward the letter of ecclesiastical law, which Rome developed to the greatest exactness. This difference brought East and West into conflict over the allegiance of the Slavs, and Constantinople, gaining the ascendancy, impressed her chief religious charac-

teristics upon all the Slavic peoples. Among these were included Constantinople's greatest mission achievement, the Church of Russia. We have traced the development of the Christianity which Russia received from the East. The following pages will show how sacredly she has guarded that faith, for nearly a thousand years.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIANITY ENTERS RUSSIA.

From the highest shoulder of the hills of Kiev the crowd looks down on a broad curve of the Dneiper, glancing little flashes of sunlight as the breeze ruffles its yellow surface. But the joyous day is oddly reflected in the strained faces of these uneasy groups which cluster about an irregular open circle, within which none presumes to pass. The center of the open space is marked by the huge wooden statue of the great God Peroun with his silver head and beard of gold. And between glances at the idol and down at the stately river, the people speak together in shuddering whispers: "Will the Prince do what he has said? What terrible things will come upon us if Peroun is overthrown?"

At a new movement all heads turn to greet the sound of chanting, accompanied by a rhythmic chink of metal upon metal and around the corner of the great log palace of Vladimir there appear the banners of a church procession. Behind the gold brocade of the priests marches the Prince himself, his chain armor, like that of the warriors who follow him, jingling dully as he steps. In silence the crowd parts to let the procession approach the idol. The chanting stops and the Prince walks toward the effigy. The awed crowd holds its breath. With a decisive movement Vladimir draws his blue steel sword and lifting it high strikes a huge splinter from the side of the statue which, but a few years before, he himself had set up. At the thwack of the blade in the wood, an audible gasp escapes the lips of the pale-faced spectators and the circle widens,

as each in his place draws back a bit, in fear. Still no one runs away. As though in a bad dream, when the will fights to move the unresponsive members into escape from threatening danger, so here the crowd plainly would flee, but some stronger power holds them bound to the spot. "Why are you frightened?" the Prince asks one white-faced onlooker. "There is a wound", pointing to the clean wood where his sword has splintered the weather-beaten surface — "do you see blood?" But the man, as though unable to believe his sight, gazes with open mouth and wide eyes at the insulted god and makes no reply.

The warriors come forward, the sun flashing on their pointed steel caps. Ropes are brought and fastened about the idol. The horses shy a bit as they are made fast to the rope. It is as though they too shared the apprehension of the people. At a word from Vladimir the whips crack over the brown backs of the horses, there is a lunge and a straining of ropes, and with a heavy crash Peroun, the great god of Kiev, lies prostrate on the ground.

Led by the horses dragging the idol, the procession of priests and warriors forms again and the chanting begins anew. With incredulous faces the crowd divides to let the cortege move down the slope and, still strangely silent, flows in to follow it.

The Christian hymn soars higher, with the warriors joining in, as the procession approaches the river's edge, a shelving bank which almost overhangs the shimmering water. And even some of the crowd which follows break their silence to voice a hesitant note or two with the other singers. As he has fallen from his high place on the hill, so now Peroun, dishonored yet unanswering, begins to lose his position of awful respect in the minds of the populace. The company of people about the chanting priests increases until only a small group is left of those who look on from a distance, as the procession halts at the edge of

the declivity. The horses are untied, a dozen mailed shoulders set against the huge wooden figure, and with a sudden heave it goes plunging over the bank. And as Peroun, with head half submerged, floats slowly down the river, the last of his faithful worshippers follow sadly along the bank. Idolatry is forsaking Kiev.

But the crowd about the gold-robed priests moves with them along the river in the opposite direction, until the bank slopes easily to the water's edge and here the procession stops for a long and solemn service. The priests whom Prince Vladimir had brought back from conquered Kherson sing the baptismal service, and doffing their garments, the company of warriors steps down into the water. After them press the crowd, old and young, until all the marge of the river is filled with people awaiting the close of the service. And as the priest passes along, one section at a time dips down beneath the surface of the stream, as the name of some saint is bestowed upon all the men in the group. There is a glint of sunshine on wet flesh, a triumphant burst of music from the priestly choir, and the people of Kiev have become a part of the Orthodox Church.

So, the old chronicler tells us, Christianity entered Russia as the official religion. To this day, in the Russian Church the festival of "St. Vladimir-equal-to-the- Apostles" is celebrated with great pomp. Because there are no contemporary records of his time, we are dependent upon tradition for details of his life as for this tale of the baptism of the Ruci, as Byzantium knew them. The date, 989, seems fairly certain: the fact that in this year Christianity was officially recognized we may also put down as sure, for it was in this year that Vladimir after having besieged and taken Kherson, demanded of the Constantinopolitan Emperor, Basil II, the hand of his sister in marriage. The Princess Anna consented, we are told, on condition that Vladimir would embrace Christianity. The Prince was baptized, and the marriage

celebrated, in the Church of the Virgin in Kherson, and after formally restoring the city to Byzantium Vladimir returned to his own capital, Kiev, bringing with him the ecclesiastical personnel he needed for making Christianity the religion of his household.

In all of this early history there are only a few points at which we are able to distinguish clearly between fact and legend. There are countless traditions as to Vladimir's reasons for accepting Christianity. The early stories tell how he was aided by a Christian priest in the taking of Kherson, and later, cured of blindness by the rite of baptism. Even the tale of the baptism of all the people is robbed of its atmosphere of spontaneity by the account of Vladimir's edict abolishing the pagan gods and commanding all people, upon pain of death, to appear for baptism. The Chronicler adds naively: "Some were baptized gladly; some hesitating, said it must be a good religion else the Prince and his chieftains would not have embraced it; others went down into the water through fear of the Prince's displeasure".

We are not to gather from this account, however, that like its entrance with Augustine into Britain where there were practically no Teutonic Christians at all, Christianity came thus abruptly into Russia. On the contrary, there are traces of Russian Christianity reaching back at least a century before Vladimir and there is no doubt that there had been a Christian community in Kiev for a long time, though how large it was we have no means of knowing. For generations Kiev had been in intermittent relationship with Constantinople. We first hear of the terrifying descent upon that city in 860 of a fleet of boats commanded by Oskold and Dir, leaders of a conquering government they had recently set up in Kiev. Again tradition is more interesting than fact, and we read how Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, routed the Russian fleet by a storm caused when he dipped the miraculous robe of the Virgin in the Bosphorus. Other attacks

later, by war-fleets from Kiev, resulted in treaties and closer communication with Constantinople and in the consequent intercourse, doubtless some knowledge of Christianity penetrated the Dneiper valley.

That some Russians were Christians already in 944, is shown by the record of a treaty between Constantinople and Igor, Prince of Kiev, when part of the Russian warriors took oath on the Gospels, and part at the feet of Peroun. With Igor's widow, Olga, who succeeded him on the throne, we come again into touch with fairly reliable records. That she was a Christian is certain and there is considerable basis for the statement that she was baptized in Constantinople in 957 by the Patriarch, with the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogennitos as sponsor.

It was under the influence of Olga, we are told, that her grandson Vladimir received Christian training. His father Sviatoslav, however, seems to have shown no evidences of the new faith and paganism still flourished in Kiev. It was only under Vladimir that Christianity replaced idolatry as the official religion, with a church erected on the hill where formerly Peroun had been worshipped.

Beginning with this church, Vladimir set about encouraging the spread of Christianity throughout all his realm. The fact that the service-books in the Slavonic tongue had long been in use in Bulgaria and other Slavic countries, and that thus a clergy was available who could use the language of the people was, of course, of great assistance to the Prince of Kiev in carrying forward his work of extending the influence of Christianity. Bringing artisans from abroad, he built the first stone church in Russia and endowed it with a tithe of his income. If you go to Kiev today you will find the "Church of the Tithes", with the sarcophagus of Vladimir in its crypt.

The edict in which this tithe is enacted is one of the most significant things left to us from Vladimir's

reign. We can trace the close influence of Constantinople in every line. As Justinian had done in the "Nomocanon", Vladimir defines church and civil authority, and even takes the additional step of binding himself and his successors to refrain from interference in those affairs specifically delegated to the church. As in Byzantium, there are some phases of the civil law in which the authority of the church is recognized as having prior jurisdiction. Like Constantinople, too, the new center of religion at Kiev speedily became a source of missionary effort. Encouraged by Vladimir, priests went out through all his realm, combating paganism and founding churches. We get an idea of the extent of their labors when we read of Leontius, the first historical Metropolitan of Kiev, within ten years from the baptism of the Kievans, who divides the Russian territory into five dioceses including points as far away as Vladimir and Novgorod. (Not Nijni Novgorod, but the older city, now little more than a village, near Petrograd.) The desire of Vladimir to see his people converted was fulfilled, in theory at least.

Just who were these Russians over whom Vladimir held sway? There is much dispute over technical details of the primitive ethnography of Russia, but authorities generally agree upon its broader outlines. The native Slavic peoples inhabiting the upper Dneiper and Volga valleys seem, at some early date, to have come into contact with the "Varangians", a race of nomadic warriors known as far away from Russia as Constantinople and Greece for their fearless exploits in battle and their wide travels. These Varangians are evidently kin of the Norsemen who touched England and the coasts of France and we trace many points of resemblance between the two. The Varangians were doubtless of Scandinavian origin. This is indicated, among other ways, by the decidedly Scandinavian nomenclature of the early princes and some of the towns they founded. "Ruric" and "Suzdal" are evidently of Norse or Scandi-

navian importation. Legend tells how the Russian Slavs invited these Varangians to come and rule over them. Just what the process was we do not know but we first find them ruling princes at Novgorod, whence their influence extended to Kiev. From this town their expeditions occasionally sallied forth to menace even Constantinople. At the time that Christianity came into Kiev, the Russian nation, loosely federated under the princes originally of this Varangian blood, covered a section of territory roughly indicated by a triangle with Novgorod and Vladimir in the north, and Kherson on the Black Sea, at its apices.

Another indication of this early Scandinavian connection is seen in the law-book of Yaroslav, the successor of Vladimir. Here all the characteristic forms of Norse legal codes are found. Trial by combat, the punishment of witchcraft, the fixing of blood-money payment in lieu of other punishment for crime—all these are written in Yaroslav's "Russian Rights", the foundation of all subsequent Russian codes of law, issued early in the eleventh century.

The reign of Yaroslav was notable for many other things besides the founding of a law-code. With Kiev as his capital he held dominion over all the Russians. He entered upon a program of building such as Russia was not to know again for centuries. With Christianity there had been introduced other elements of civilization, and throughout the Russian land there spread the newer culture. Christianity introduced music vastly superior to the primitive forms in which the Russians had hitherto known it, and architecture, which was almost unheard of before this time. Thus the glory of Yaroslav's cities was their churches, and their gold domes shining above the mud ramparts of the towns were centers of inspiration for a new phase of culture in the Russian land.

Another significant feature of Yaroslav's sovereignty, and a point which will help to fix the period in our

minds, is the connection at this time with Europe and the West. It was Yaroslav who organized the great attack upon Constantinople in 1046 which caused such terror in the heart of Byzantium. The resultant treaty left Kiev in closer touch than ever with Constantinople, but Yaroslav also had relations with most of the other important European powers of his time. His sister was the wife of Kasimir, King of Poland. Elizabeth, his daughter married Harold the Brave, King of the Normans. Another daughter was Queen of France; still another, the wife of Andrew I of Hungary. Yaroslav gave asylum to various exiled princes, among them St. Olaf of Norway and two English princes, sons of Edward Ironsides. The Russian monarch was in such comprehensive touch with the western world as he probably never was again until the days of Peter the Great.

And Yaroslav had a great capital in Kiev. Its prince had adorned it with the finest churches in the land. In imitation of Constantinople he had built a copy of St. Sophia, with gorgeous gold and mosaic decorations. The old frescoes still preserved in that time-honored church in Kiev bear inscriptions not in Slavonic but in Greek, witness of its Hellenic inheritance. Kiev was the meeting- place of all the merchants of the north and west. Traders from Holland and England, from Hungary and Scandinavia, lived, each in their separate quarters in the town. On a more modest scale, it parallelled the position of Constantinople under Justinian, as a splendid city, cosmopolitan and powerful — the seat of the reigning prince and of the Metropolitan who was highest dignitary of its new but widely-organized church.

This organization like the federation of the Russian princedoms was of a rather loose nature, though certain canonical rules were rigidly adhered to. The Metropolitan of Kiev was appointed and consecrated in Constantinople, but he was practically a free agent in the

management of Russian church affairs. In the same manner, for a time the various bishops were appointed by the Metropolitan and consecrated in Kiev. Later, however, it came to be the custom to elect bishops by a common assembly, a sort of town-meeting of the people in the Cathedral city. The bishops were chosen usually, though not always, from among the monastic orders rather than from the parochial, or "white" clergy, and always looked to the Metropolitan for their formal ordination, although they were little under his direction in the administration of their local affairs. And as these bishops were elected by their flocks, so sometimes they were also deposed by the same authority. Thus we read of a town-meeting in Novgorod in 1228 when the long rainy autumn had begun to cause uneasiness on account of the crops, where the people decided "It stays warm this way, because of Arsenti" (the Bishop), and drove him out of the city.

In thinking of the spread of Christianity over all the country ruled from Kiev, nothing could be more misleading than to consider the whole population as suddenly Christian, having completely cast aside their pagan beliefs. Peroun was overthrown, but he was merely one of a whole flock of pagan deities, most of them less tangible, and therefore all the more difficult for the new religion to combat. The paganism of Russia at the time of the entry of Christianity was in a sort of transition stage between the private, household respect of nature-deities and their more exactly defined public worship by tribes or communities. The Slav was just beginning to set up public shrines to the mythical gods he knew, but his whole personal life, like that of other primitive peoples, was bound up with a wide belief in all sorts of spirits of nature and common experience. He had a fairly well-defined cycle of feasts regulated by the sun, for any agricultural people the chief god, and extending throughout the solar year. There was a festival of rejoicing, marked by something

resembling old English carol-singing and the interchange of good wishes for the coming year, in honor of the winter solstice, the birth of a new sun. Another, "the Feast of the Red Hill", occurred at the first signs of spring, when the hill-tops appeared through the snow and even the dead were said to rejoice. All this, of course, was public ceremony, and it is curious to note how gradually these general festivals disappeared as heathen rites and changed into, or were replaced by Christian festivals at the same periods of the year and often with similar designations. We find the celebration of the victory of Yuria, the Spring-god, over dark Winter, merging into a Christian festival of St. George with his conquest over the dragon. In our own times the festival of "George the Victory-bringer" in the Russian Church year is a springtime event. And even to this day the second Monday after Easter is known among the village folks by the old pagan title of the holiday of the "Red Hill", "Krasnaya Gorka". So, in the open, the new faith prevailed and public expression of paganism was gradually conquered and merged into Christian practices.

With the personal, household belief in nature-spirits and the like, the Christian forces made no such facile shift. Living as he did in woods and fields where for generations every aspect of his surroundings had been personified and where all his actions had been habituated in accord with the assumption of these many sprites and deities, the Russian peasant found it quite impossible to throw off his superstitious practices. Authority, civil or ecclesiastical, might forbid his public observance of pagan belief, but it had no power to penetrate to the inner shrine of these ancient customs, in the privacy of his household, and these domestic usages were long preserved unchanged. The folk-gods of house and field and river were too indefinite to be simply overthrown like Peroun, and in consequence the popular views of nature, its signs, its

superstitions and charms, remained intact in the minds of common folk for long generations. As late as the twelfth century we learn that only the more cultured classes practiced solely Christian rites of marriage, the mass of the people still following many of their ancient pagan usages. And when, shortly before the Tatar invasion, the state compelled children to learn to write, their parents resisted with tears, fearing the strange new sorcery.

It is only with this picture clearly in mind of a twilight-zone between pure paganism and pure Christianity, with much of the old superstition and usage retained long after the formal acceptance of the new faith, that one can properly understand the progress of Christian belief in Russia. Peasant folk-tales of all periods teem with accounts of St. Nicholas or the Prophet Elijah in connection with weather-making. Less than a hundred years ago there were tribes in the Volga valley such as the Tchouvatches which still secretly practiced the rites of paganism. And even today on the frontiers of civilization in the north of the Tomsk Government in Siberia, the yet unbaptized nomad peoples come into Christian churches on the holiday of St. Nicholas, patron saint of travellers, and set a candle before his ikon. The undercurrent of primitive cosmology and the superstition which went with it has never completely ceased in the mind of the common folk of Russia, and he who would truly comprehend their conception of Christianity must take this factor carefully into account. In certain aspects Russian Christianity of the nineteenth century is that of the tenth, preserved unaltered for thirty generations.

So Christianity spread, under the wise Yaroslav and for two hundred years after, penetrating all corners of the Russian land with little churches set in green forests as the centers of new civilization for all the people. The service in these churches, as well as the organization of which their priests were a part, was

a direct inheritance from Byzantium. The customs and usages of the church, too, were brought unchanged and unchanging from the city on the Golden Horn. And as Constantinople was the center for a great ecclesiastical appanage, so Kiev, the capital of the land of the Russian princes, held control of all its churchly organization. It was the seat of the Metropolitan appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople. It had the holiest shrines and the greatest churches. From Kiev radiated the light of missionary effort, which spread the faith of Christianity, superficially, at least, through all the land.

And we must in no wise minimize the importance of this missionary effort or the civilizing effect of Christianity. Although there was still a persistent undercurrent of paganism, and a peasant in the church could cross himself before the picture of St. Cosmas and say a prayer to Kouznetz, "the Smith", whose name had a similar sound, and who, somewhere in the mountains of the north was forging the destinies of men; or Vladimirko, prince of Galitch in the pre-Mongol days, when reproached for the violation of an oath he had sealed by kissing the crucifix, could protest that "It was such a little cross": still in spite of many pagan conceptions the new faith did work marked changes in the life and customs of Russia. Under its influence monogamy almost universally replaced polygamy; the Christian virtue of hospitality, so characteristic of Russians of every class, was exalted. The duty of giving to the needy, nowhere more generally than in Russia a part of the very nature of the people, was from the first inculcated by the Church. Some of the finest traits of character Christendom knows have been the heritage of Russians for a thousand years.

CHAPTER IV.

UNDER THE TATAR KHAN.

Just two hundred years after Yaroslav the Wise had built his great church of St. Sophia, an incident occurred, involving another Prince of Kiev, which was symbolic of the two centuries and more which were immediately to follow. "In those times", the old chronicler records, "there came upon us for our sins unknown nations. No one could tell their origin, whence they came, or what religion they professed. God alone knew who they were; God and perhaps wise men learned in books". The first of a long succession of fierce Mongolian tribes pouring like a flood out of central Asia, had reached the lower Dneiper basin and threatened to annihilate the Polovtsi, inhabitants of that district. "Come and help us against these Mongols", the Polovtsi sent word to the Russian princes, "they have taken our country — tomorrow they will take yours". In response to this appeal for help from his neighbors to the East and South, Mstislav Romanovitch, Grand Prince of Kiev, together with other princes, went out to challenge the invaders. The Russian warriors fought nobly, but one by one their regiments were overwhelmed by the countless multitude of the Tatars, with their studded leather caps and their showers of steel-barbed arrows, until Mstislav alone was left, holding a little fort on the banks of the Kalka. The Tatars demanded his capitulation, promising safety upon payment of a ransom for himself and his company. Mstislav agreed, but the promise was broken. The Tatars massacred his troops and then proceeded to celebrate their complete victory in a great feast set upon a pile of planks

under which the Prince of Kiev and his two sons-in-law were slowly suffocated. And what happened to Mstislav and his warriors was a presage of the approaching fate of all of Russia. So the Tatars were to come and work their will on the Russian land for more than two hundred years. This was but the vanguard of successive invasions, when wave after wave of the terrible horde from the East swept over one princedom after another, ravaging and burning and making captives.

If we ask who were these wild invaders, we find ourselves reverting almost to the words of the old chronicler: "No one could tell their origin". They seem to have been the expansion armies of a new kingdom recently set up in the Mongolian steppes, uniting all the tribes inhabiting that part of Asia. Their fierce conquests in China and toward the South had won for them a name which inspired terror in all neighboring peoples. And as they grew stronger and ever-increasing territory came under their power, the dream of world-control, so often the delusion of a great military regime, came to them as well. Following out this expansion policy of the Great Khan, the Tatar hordes overflowed one province of Russia after another, with varying degrees of destruction and pillage.

A twentieth-century reader finds it hard to understand how a nomad barbarian tribe could so easily overcome the Russians, who at this period were the peers of any other Europeans in general culture, if he does not remember that the Tatars came to fight a people divided against itself. Torn by the wars of rival princes, even the loose federation of the earlier days of the Kiev monarchy had been broken, and the Tatars found no united forces to bar their way. Beside this, as in the Feudal days of Western Europe, the aristocracy alone bore arms, so among the Russians only the nobles were fighters, whereas the Tatars were all men of battle. Then too, the Mongols came in such countless multitudes, that the ratio of numbers was over-

whelmingly against the Russians. There are no accurate accounts, of course, but there is no doubt of their prodigality with the lives of their soldiers: one old writer tells us that they thought nothing of the loss of ten thousand men in the taking of a town. And this resistless tide of yellow men had already been operating in Asia and the Caucasus for sufficient time to have acquired a great name as invincible warriors, so that when the poorly organized Russians, limited in their number of fighting men, confronted an apparently endless river of the all-conquering Mongols, there could be but one ultimate result and all Russia came under the power of the Great Khan.

The first great wave of the Tatar Horde swept across South Russia. Kiev was taken and pillaged, and the most holy shrines of Russia desecrated by pagan hands. Subsequent inroads were made upon the central and northern Volga valley, then upon Novgorod, until almost all of what is now European Russia, save the Baltic States and a sort of twilight zone to the east of them, came under the complete domination of the invaders. This subjection to Asia, however, was not so terrible as it may seem at first glance. While the earlier conquests of the Tatars did wreak great destruction and many people were put to the sword, the later invaders resorted to no such terroristic methods. This may have been because their earlier exploits had so cowed the Russians that they offered no very active resistance. At any rate, the Tatar Khans were usually content to leave Russian princes on their thrones if they would guarantee certain tribute and subject themselves to the dominion of their conquerors. Often the Russian princes had to make the prodigious pilgrimage to the "Center of Asia" to present themselves and their submission before the face of the Great Khan himself. For although these nomad conquerors remained nomadic, never settling long in a place, and thus for varying

periods of time the Russians were free from the actual presence of the Tatars, still there was the ever-present possibility of a fresh wave of the oppressors, wandering somewhere in search of new worlds to conquer, and hence Russian princes had little chance to ignore their fealty to Asiatic overlords.

The two centuries during which the Tatars controlled Russia have left an impress upon its life which we can trace through all subsequent history. Probably one of its prime effects lies in the fact that it isolated Russia from the West, from all contact with the progress of civilization in the rest of Europe. No longer did the princes of France or England have dealings with those of Muscovy: instead, Russia became a part of that vague land to the East under the control of the barbarians, and Europe forgot all about her former connections there. And she forgot so completely that when the first English expedition set out to visit Russia, three hundred years later, we read how the chief source at which Willoughby and Chancellor sought information about that land "on the East of the Globe", was a pair of Tatars, who happened through some strange mischance to be among the grooms in their King's stable. For long centuries the rest of Europe knew little of Russia.

And of course the Russians could know as little of what was going on in Europe. What with the domination of their new masters, and the barrier of the right horn of the Islamic crescent which curved between their land and the rest of civilization, the people of Russia found themselves completely cut off from further contact with the culture of the West. The chief result of this isolation was that the best civilization Russia knew until the sixteenth century was that which Europe had shown her, previous to the middle of the thirteenth. Most of this culture had come into the Kievan land with the entrance of the Church and had been fostered and extended by its missions. It was thus indefinitely

connected in Russian thought, with the idea of religion. Russia had received the Orthodox belief with the solemn injunction to guard it unaltered, and with true Slavic fidelity, this thirteenth century civilization was preserved unchanged, through long generations. To this day the Russian word for peasant is Krestianin, "a Christian", direct inheritance of the times when, although the nobility showed some tendencies toward adopting the customs of their Tatar overlords, the common folk held rigidly to the primitive faith and the rude culture which they had received at the hand of Western Europe.

It is often claimed that another result of this long dominion of the Tatars was to crush out forever the spirit of political and national independence in the mind of the Russian folk. And if this may seem to be the fact, one must temper his thought of Russian submission by one or two considerations. In the first place, this rule of the Tatars was not such absolute subjugation as might at first appear. The conquerors were very liberal. Russian laws and customs and especially, as we shall later note, Russian faith, were left untouched, and the people were permitted to follow them as they chose. Taxation for tribute fell chiefly upon the nobles, and the common mass of peasantry felt the burden but lightly, so that what seems like oppression was not actually such an iron regime as the ordinary use of the word connotes. And so long as the most sacred rights of the Russian, his national customs and his church, were not interfered with and he could go peacefully about earning his bread, he felt he had little cause to complain of tyranny.

Let a threatening hand be raised against his church, however, and the Russian was no such meek person. The best example of that fact which this period affords is in the person and the romantic story of Alexander of the Neva, giant in frame and mind, warrior and statesman and defender of the faith, now

known to every Russian as St. Alexander Nevski. As Prince of Novgorod, Alexander was the last of the Russian princes to come under the Tatar yoke. Before this actually occurred his people were confronted with another peril from the West. The German Catholic Knights of Livonia, encouraged by the Pope, attempted the forcible subjection not only of the pagan tribes near the Baltic and the Finnish Gulf, but also, aided by the Swedes, began to press in upon the Orthodox Russians. This was an invasion of the heretics and the Russians rose against it. After a night of prayer in the cathedral, Alexander put himself at the head of his warriors and went out to do battle for the Orthodox faith. The clash came on the frozen surface of Lake Chudovo, (1242) and in a battle that the old chroniclers speak of as the "Blood Bath on the Ice", the enemy was put to rout, and the Russian land and the Russian faith saved from subjection to the Teutons.

When later the Tatar Khan threatened to send his hordes upon Novgorod, Alexander's statesmanship showed itself in his personal journey to the court of the Great Khan, and in the favorable terms he obtained for his people. It required a man of the greatest calibre to persuade the independent Novgorodians to accept these terms rather than the alternative of certain destruction at the hands of the Mongols, but Alexander succeeded and came to be such an appreciated protector and sovereign that when he died, and the word came to the Metropolitan at the cathedral altar, he announced it to the people through his tears in the words: "My children, the Sun of Russia has set". Popular grief was such that the choir could not sing when the hero was buried, and his canonization four generations later was but an expression of the common feeling that as he had been their advocate in life, so now in the Heavenly Court his efforts could be called upon to preserve his people. Stand any day before the splendid silver shrine of St. Alexander Nevski, in

Petrograd, and watch the people paying reverence to the costly casket which contains his body, and you will see that Russia still remembers the champions of her faith. The Tatar yoke was heavy but it never completely crushed the Russian spirit of independence. Nationality became closely associated with religion in the mind of the Russian, and he resisted to the last ounce of his strength any attempt at the domination of either.

We have noticed that the first and cruelest invasion of the Tatar hordes covered the Dneiper valley. It was as a direct outgrowth of this fact that the third important political result of Mongol supremacy arose, namely, the placing of a new center of Russian life in what was more nearly the geographical center of the Russian land. With Kiev in ruins, the focus of attention shifted northward, away from the chief impact with the Tatars, and there appears with constantly increasing emphasis the name of the city destined thenceforth to be the epitome of Russian history for a score of generations. Moskow first appears in the records in the pre-Mongol days as early as 1147. The tiny low-vaulted "Church of Our Savior in the Wood", oldest building in the Kremlin and so holy that the Great Palace must be built around it leaving its walls untouched, is a living link with the time when the first clearing was made on the wooded hill above the Moskva River, and "Our Holy Mother Moskow" came into being. Would you find all of Russian history beneath your gaze at once? Then study Moskow, with its every street and stone a page from the romance of the past. It was in this period of the Tatar domination that Moskow came into her original prominence.

And in the consideration of the political consequences of the Tatar supremacy in Russia, the converse of the medal must not be overlooked. A brief glance will suffice to show its effects upon the rest of Europe. The world at large concedes that what saved Paris

in those first critical weeks of the War in 1914 was the counter attack of the armies of the Tsar, thundering at the East gates of Germany. What the world does not often remember is that that salvation was purchased at a cost in blood such as possibly no other nation ever paid. Munitioned on the pitiful scale of one rifle to every five men, the Muscovite troops met the highly machined German defense "with their breasts", as the Russians say, and died like sickled grain, but Paris was saved. Just so, in those dim days of the 13th and 14th centuries, though the Tatar wave did actually break over the Russian land into Galicia, still its force was spent ere it reached those limits, and Russia bore in her body the scars of Tatar servitude, a sacrifice which probably saved the rest of Western civilization. Europe's debt to Russia dates back seven hundred years before it was again renewed by Russia's part in the World War.

Cut off from cultured Europe, subject to the will of nomadic Mongol hosts, Russia lived a separate existence for the two centuries that oppression lasted. What was the story of the Russian Church of that period?

If the Tatars were liberally disposed toward the Russians, it was nowhere better evidenced than in their attitude regarding the Russian Church and its ministers. How much of this was due to a true spirit of toleration and how much to a superstitious respect for the priesthood of any religion, it is difficult to determine. The Tatars themselves were pagan before their rather nominal acceptance of Islam, some time after entering Russia, and were accustomed to regard with peculiar reverence the official representatives of any faith. One of the earliest documents we know from this Mongol period is a statement of policy toward the Christian clergy. "Let no one injure the Orthodox Church, the Metropolitan Peter or the priests in Russia", the Khan orders. "Let their lands be free from all

tax and tribute: for all this belongs to God, and these people by their prayers preserve us". At any rate the clergy, as in Byzantium and under the Russian princes, were exempt from civil duties and the payment of taxation. They were thus left free to carry on, unhindered, the services of the church and the spread of its precepts.

This tolerance of the Church's ministers was soon extended to its property, and under the Tatars building prospered and the material wealth of the organization increased. Although experiencing no such vivid crises during this period as did the Church of the West, still the Russian Church continued to develop, under Tatar dominion, almost without interference in its normal course.

The political and ecclesiastical importance of the Tatar attitude will at once be evident. In addition to making it a great factor in maintaining order and the quiet acceptance of the Mongol yoke, this favor shown the Church served greatly to exalt it in the eyes of Russians themselves. The Church alone of all the old institutions was untouched, standing unharmed through all the storm of alien conquest, and as never before it became the center of the Russian's ideal, the ultimate shrine of his patriotism.

Although the spiritual progress of the Church was unaltered, its geography, like that of Russian politics, was intimately affected by the Tatar lordship. With the holy places of Kiev desecrated by the earliest attack of the Mongols, and the center of gravity of the state shifted northward, the seat of the Metropolitans made a like removal. Maxim, the first Russian prelate to have his official residence outside of Kiev, came to Vladimir in 1299, but with the rising importance of Moskow it was less than twenty-five years before his successor, Peter, took up his See in what was already the actual if not the official capital of the Russian land. He it was who secured the "Yarlik", or dispensation

quoted above, exempting the lands and officials of the Church from state control, which document served as a charter of rights in the eyes of all succeeding Mongol rulers. He witnessed the foundation of the Cathedral of the Assumption, in the Kremlin, and his tomb is one of the four cornerstones of that Russian holy of holies, today, built upon the site of the earlier church. The embroidered cap in which he celebrated the Liturgy still lies on his stone coffin, and the staff of this first Metropolitan to reside in Moskow stands beside the altar as though he had left it but yesterday, instead of six long centuries ago.

It has been said that Moskow epitomizes all of Russian history, political or ecclesiastical. This may be affirmed with equal truth of the monasteries which dot the Russian land to every corner of its vast expanse, as daisies dot a field. Nowhere in the dealings of the Mongols with the Church is their toleration better portrayed than in the picture presented by the rise and spread of monasteries, and their ultimate effect upon the Russian nation.

Probably the earliest monastic establishment appeared at Kiev within the first century of Russian Christianity. The two monks chiefly concerned in its foundation were later canonized and are among the most honored of Russian saints. Antony and Theodosius set up a monastic regime of the strictest type, basing their discipline on that of Theodore of the Studium and within a few years the monastery had become a place noted for its sanctity through all the dominion of the princes of Kiev. But this, with the rest of the town, was pillaged by the Tatars and for a time lost its renown. Later, it again became a resort of pilgrims, and so it has continued, until today there is an almost continuous procession of the faithful gathered from all corners of the Russian world, passing along the winding subterranean corridors to salute the treasured relics of eight centuries of saints, or attending service

in the splendid gold-crowned churches which almost fill the huge enclosure of the monastery walls.

Another monastery, founded like hundreds of others under the Tatar yoke, has played a more dramatic part in the history of the Russia of the Moskow period, a time whose beginning and end used to be thought of as fixed. Now, with the Russian capital once more in Moskow and a Patriarch again at the head of the Church, it seems almost as though the two centuries since Peter built his capital on the Neva were but a passing interlude, and that the whole history of Russia since the middle of the 12th century should be viewed with Moskow as its center and norm. The Sergievsky Monastery of the Holy Trinity, about forty miles east of Moskow, is named from its founder, Sergius of Radonezh, and its history has been so closely bound up with the growth of the Muscovite empire that it is as though every stone in its battlemented fortress walls were a page in the story. Founding a hermit church in the midst of the wooded wilderness, Sergius soon attracted to himself a whole monkish community, gradually increasing in fame and property until it was the most holy place in Russia. To it great warriors came for the Abbot's blessing. From it sometimes went out warrior monks who fought like giants, with chain armor over their monastic habit. At one time the Sergievsky cloister was the last fortress of Orthodox Russia uncaptured by the Poles, and the tale of the long siege which resulted in an accession of Russian strength and the expulsion of the invaders reads like an Arthurian chronicle. The Monastery became a center of new life and learning in this part of Russia. Go to visit it today, with its walls still showing the thousand scars of honorable battle: stand in the chapel where continuous prayers are read by a changing company of monks before the silver coffin of the Holy Sergius, and you are irresistibly drawn back through the centuries to trace the history of all of Muscovy.

This particular monastery is but typical of the hundreds which sprang up throughout Russia during the Tatar oppression. One hundred and eighty new ones are counted in a single half century. Times were hard and the attraction of the monastic life as an escape from the cares of the world was strong. Some of the best men of those centuries took the vows and lived useful lives within monastery walls. As in the western Europe of those times, these communities became centers of learning and enlightenment: villages and towns sprang up around them and their influence and importance was ever enlarging.

And as their members increased, so the territory these monasteries covered was ever widening. New "podvizhniks", athletes of the spirit, were always striking out into uncharted wildernesses or among pagan tribes to found new hermitages, and after them came others with the inevitable result that new monastic communities blossomed out in an expanding circle from Moskow. Typical of this company of pioneers is St. Stephen of Perm, who went out to the pagan tribes in what is now the province of that name, near the Urals. Learning their language, Stephen made an alphabet to fit the pagan tongue and translated for them the Gospels and the Liturgy. He was appointed Bishop of Perm, and the whole territory gradually came under the civilizing and Russifying influence of the Church.

In a similar manner there appears a cloister on an island in the White Sea, the now famous Solovetski Monastery, and another on Lake Ladoga — each a center of ever-widening influence, educational and cultural as well as purely religious. The importance of these mission monasteries can scarcely be overestimated. Here under the very eyes of the Tatar Khans was growing and expanding a force which was one day to unite all Russia against them. The monks and priests in every one of these many cloisters all

centered their thoughts on Moskow. They all were under the spiritual authority of its Metropolitan. Inevitably, through all these wide-flung stretches of Russian land there grew up a sense of unity with Moskow which needed but the political genius of a trio of its princes to weld into a great empire. The pioncering value of these monkish missionaries throughout the North and East of Russia under the Tatars, with the resulting spread of civilization, is parallelled only by the manner in which Christian missions of the 19th century pioneered the way for Western commerce and culture in China.

The Sergievsky Monastery is intimately connected with the first important move the Russians made toward throwing off the Tatar yoke. To its Abbot came the Grand Prince of Moskow, Dmitri Ivanovitch, on the eve of his great expedition against the mongol Khan, Mamai. By a series of masterly military strokes, Dmitri had made himself the acknowledged head of most of the appanages adjacent to Moskow. He had also won minor victories against lesser Tatar chieftains and the Grand Khan gathered his forces for a terrible revenge. Now at the call of Dimitri, the armies from a dozen Russian princedoms, united for once against a common enemy, came together in Moskow and all marched out past the monastery where the holy Sergius was still Abbot. The Abbot gave his blessing and predicted for Dmitri a complete but bloody victory. Two of the monks from the cloister were also sent to fight with the Grand Prince, and as St. Sergius marked the sign of the Cross on their robes, "Behold", he cried, "a weapon which faileth never". It was really a spirit closely akin to that of the Crusaders, which led out these Russian armies. They were not only defenders of their land but champions of the Orthodox faith, as well, and nothing could have more greatly inspired their courage.

The Russians met the forces of Mamai near the Don at a place called Kulikovo Field. As had been

predicted, it was a bloody encounter. After an all day's battle, the Mongols fled leaving, we are told, a hundred thousand dead on the field. But the Russians as well had suffered terribly. The bodies of the two warrior monks were found, one of them locked in a death embrace with a giant warrior of the Khan. Dmitri himself was unharmed, although he had been in the hottest of the fighting. From this time he bore the surname Donskoi (of the Don), in remembrance of the famous victory. The event marked an epoch in Russian history. Although the Tatars came back once more to wreak vengeance upon Moskow, still the century-long tradition of slavery to the Mongols was broken, and the way paved for the final bursting of their chains. When Dmitri died in 1389 he left a territory larger than had ever before been the appanage of a Prince of Moskow. Under his reign Stephen had gone out to conquer the district of Perm for the Church and although that territory formally acknowledged the power of the Prince of Moskow only under Ivan the Third, just after our period, still the seed of a united Russia was sown. Dmitri's successors for nearly a hundred years gradually extended this territory and power until it formed a rough half-circle drawn from Moskow as the center, with the distance to Nijni Novgorod as its radius. West of Moskow the Prince's power did not extend far; there were the rival princedoms of Galicia and Latvia. But all centered at Moskow. There too, the Church had its capital and the ties which bound the Russians to their Church were soon to become almost identical with those that bound them into a nation.

Two other events must be noted in closing this period when the Russian Metropolitans were still appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, both of importance to Russia, although occurring outside its borders. The first was the Council of Florence, 1439, when in a frantic effort to get Western help to save his tottering empire from the Saracens, John V,

the Byzantine Emperor, joined in a council called by the Pope of Rome and forced his ecclesiastical companions, delegates to the assembly, to sign a reluctant agreement of union with the Roman Church. The Metropolitanate of Moskow was vacant, and wishing to assure the representation of the Russian Church at the coming council with Rome, the Patriarch of Constantinople appointed Isidore, a Greek Abbot, to be Metropolitan in Moskow, without waiting for the Grand Prince to send a Russian candidate. Such a candidate in the person of one Jonah, was already on the way, had Constantinople but known it, and he crossed paths with the newly appointed Metropolitan for Russia.

Upon his arrival in Moskow, Isidore at once began to preach of the benefits to accrue to all Christendom from the coming Florentine Council, and then taking several Russian delegates with him, left for Italy. The decisions of the council accepting all the points on which the East had always held Rome to be heretical, although signed by most of the Eastern delegates, some under the severest pressure from the Emperor, were repudiated by the great majority, clergy and laity alike, of all the Eastern churches as soon the delegates brought back word of what had been done. Russia was no exception to the rule. After a long delayed return to Moskow, before which time Isidore had tried by means of circular letters to prepare the hearts of the Russians for the new scheme, he finally came to conduct a service in the Church of the Assumption. He caused the Latin cross to be carried at the head of the procession, and in the Liturgy he mentioned the name of the Pope before that of the Patriarch of Constantinople. And when, at the close of the service, he caused the document of union to be read aloud and the long hated "Filioque" clause appeared, the Grand Prince Vasili the Blind, voicing the horror of the multitude, proclaimed Isidore a Latin seducer and a heretic and ordered his imprisonment.

A council of Russian bishops declared Isidore deposed and the former candidate for the position of Metropolitan was again chosen. Two attempts to have Jonah consecrated by the Constantinopolitan Patriarch were unavailing, so it was decided that he should assume the post without further delay. A council of Russian bishops placed him on the Metropolitan's throne and sent a most careful letter to Constantinople to explain their act, saying that the need was great and that communication with Constantinople had long been so difficult that they knew not even if there was a Patriarch now in office. Later, apparently, the appointment was approved by the Patriarch, but it set a new precedent. Henceforth Moskow chose and enthroned its own Metropolitans, although in no wise breaking friendship with Constantinople and the Patriarch. Communication was kept up as much as possible and the most friendly relations maintained with all the Eastern churches.

Five years after the appointment of Jonah, Constantinople fell into the hands of the Saracens (1453) and its history as a Christian city was ended. Now in a new sense Russia was independent of the city on the Golden Horn and we find the theory arising which has been maintained with more or less seriousness ever since: Moskow is the third Rome. Though fully granting the early supremacy of Peter's city, the Eastern Church considered Rome apostate after the dispute over the "Filioque", and the power and authority which were formerly Rome's prerogative went over to Constantinople, the "New Rome". Now Moskow sees Constantinople, reduced to desperate straits by the approach of the Saracens, seeking alliance with that same heretical Rome whose spiritual fall she had so often proclaimed. The Council of Florence and the paper union with Rome, which had caused such repugnance in Moskow, were seen as signs of the falling away of the City of Constantine. And then as

though by a judgment of God, New Rome, the seat of Christian empire for more than a thousand years, fell into the hands of the heathen. Its light had fled, and Moskow came to think of herself as next in the line of capitals of the true religion. She had spurned the false union with heretical Rome, her history of Orthodoxy was unspotted; in her tabernacle the true faith was preserved, pure and unchanging.

One more event, occurring shortly before the death of Jonah in 1461, deserves to be noted as marking the beginning of a new epoch in Russian Church history. West and South-west Russia was under the control of a federation of Lithuanian princes, whose ecclesiastical fealty was paid to Rome instead of to Constantinople. As a part of the forced policy of union with Rome, the "Patriarch of Constantinople", an emigree in Rome, now appointed a new Metropolitan of Lithuania, placing a pupil of the repudiated Isidore on the newly created throne. The Moskow bishops protested, in a vigorous letter to Church authorities still in Constantinople, that the Russian Church should not be divided, and at the same time decreed that henceforth Moskow should choose her own Metropolitan. Jonah was the last to bear the title of Metropolitan of Kiev. Henceforth for many generations Russia is divided into two ecclesiastical sees, the Western under a Uniate Metropolitan and the nominal control of Rome, although the common people generally clung to their orthodox faith, in spite of the tendency of the nobles to adopt Polish culture and customs, and the Eastern half independent and self-perpetuating, with its capital at Moskow.

The new title of the Eastern prelate is most significant. Though Kiev has fallen away and much of what has once been his territory has come under Uniate hands, Theodosius, the successor of Jonah is called Metropolitan of "Moskow and all Russia". Again we see emphasized the feeling that "Russian" and "Orthodox" are synonymous. Through all succeeding cent-

urics the conviction has persisted, until a few years ago a Russian peasant could say to a foreign visitor: "In America, I suppose, all people are white, like ourselves, and of course Orthodox". Probably in no other land has the national church so completely identified itself with nationality. Perhaps no other case is on record, where the history of the Church is so intimately bound up with every phase of the history of the State.

The Mongol supremacy then, while it meant the separation of Russia from the rest of Europe, with all that involved of retarded cultural progress, was nevertheless a time of genuine development, expressed especially in the life of the Church, but later to be transmitted to strengthening the government as well. Under the Tatar dominion the missionary monasteries spread like scattered tapers in a dark cathedral, to distant and perilous parts of the Russian land. The Church was the great pioneer in civilization and culture. Now, with its Metropolitan at Moskow chosen by Russians and independent of even the nominal influence of a foreign city, it enters upon a new period, as the great unifier of the Russian people, the accepted shrine of national life and feeling.

CHAPTER V.

THE TWO METROPOLITANATES.

In the last decade of the fifteenth century Europe discovered a new world: in the same decade Russia, too, discovered a new terrain when the warriors of the Grand Prince Ivan III passed through the wintry defiles of the northern Urals and returned with fifty native princes as their captives, to say that the land they found was habitable and free, and not (as the old geographers had said) the home of mythical monsters. And although Russia made as little immediate use of her newly-found territory as Europe did of North America, still its discovery was the symbol of the general movement of affairs under the Prince who came to be known as "The Binder-Together of the Russian Land". During the forty-three years he was on the throne (1462—1505) Ivan more than tripled the domain of Moskow, but the territory extending to the north and east as far as a fortress on the Pechora although much larger, was far less important than the other sections of Russia now made subject to Ivan's rule.

One by one, the hitherto independent city-states adjoining the territory of the Grand Prince to the west and south were brought under the authority of Moskow. Novgorod the Great was compelled to own his authority, and finally after a sharp dispute was subjected by force. Her great bell, for years the signal which had called together the famous town council, was removed to Moskow and the council of the burghers of Novgorod became a historic memory. Many of its chief citizens were deported to Suzdal, and later

the hand of Ivan fell even upon the foreign market of the city where Western Europe came to trade with Russia and the East. The foreign merchants, (all nationalities together were known as "Germans" in those days) were driven out and their stores amounting to two hundred thousand dollars, confiscated. Again as in earlier centuries, a possibility of contact with the West was cut off and it was many years before other merchants ventured back into the strange land of the Prince of Moskow.

In the West, Columbus had found a new world; the Cabots had made their voyages; printing was flourishing; the whole of the Renaissance was in full motion. To Russia, shut in her cloistered isolation, tidings of these things came like echoes of a dream. Her realities were nearer at hand.

There were the Tatars, for instance. Although the power of the Horde had dwindled, and their once great capital, Sarai on the lower Volga now faced several rival Tatar cities, still the Grand Prince of Moskow was nominally a subject to the Khanate. He was an unwilling subject, however, and when in 1478 the Khan Achmet sent envoys to Moskow, Ivan put to death all but one of them and sent him back to refuse the obeisance demanded. Nothing but war could follow, and although Ivan had already earned a reputation for preferring to stay at home instead of taking active part in the expeditions of his armies, this time he put himself at the head of a splendidly equipped force and went out to meet the flouted Khan.

The two armies faced each other across the Oka, still known among the peasants as the "Girdle of the Virgin", because of its historic record as the scene of deliverances from peril. But once on the spot, Ivan seems to have felt the need for a safer and quieter place. Leaving his troops encamped, he himself returned to Moskow to meditate on the steps to be pursued. The people murmured at the cowardly delay and this

discontent finally voiced itself in the words of the heroic old Archbishop Vassian, of Rostov. Once the Abbot of the Sergievsky Monastery, Vassian could not have been untouched by its rich patriotic tradition: he sent a warm letter of exhortation to the hesitant Ivan. "Dost thou fear death?" he wrote, "Thou too must die, as well as others; death is the lot of all, man, beast and bird alike: none can avoid it. Give these warriors into my hand and old as I am, I will not spare myself, nor ever turn my back on the Tatars". To the adjurations of the militant old bishop, Gerontius, the Metropolitan, added his voice and at length Ivan returned to his army facing the troops of the Khan across the frozen Oka. Then a strange thing happened: overcome anew by fear, Ivan gave the order to retreat. The Tatars did likewise, and driven by an inexplicable panic the two armies fled from each other as rapidly as they could travel. It was the last time a Grand Khan ever threatened the Prince of Moskow. Achmet's army was dispersed by a rival Khan and his power effectually broken.

Safe home again after his inglorious conquest, Ivan's hurt pride found time to resent the interference of the two churchmen who had forced him into victory. He sought a pretext for retaliation. He had had difficulties with Gerontius before. There was the dispute arising from the dedication of the Assumption Church in the Kremlin, the year before the defeat of Achmet (1479). Someone had accused the Metropolitan of breach of canonical custom and the Tsar eagerly took up the dispute. It was charged that Gerontius had led the procession around the church "against the sun" instead of with it. God's anger would reward such a sin, the Monarch asserted. A great quarrel arose, with churchmen of all degrees taking sides. All the old books were searched; all old men interviewed. No one seems to have thought of an appeal to Greece or Constantinople for the solution of a really bitter

controversy, but finally the assertion of an abbot that on a pilgrimage to Mount Athos he had witnessed a church dedication with a procession "against the sun" reduced the Tsar's partisans to two men only. Still the Grand Prince pressed the matter and said such bitter things that shortly after the "battle" on the Oka, Gerontius retired to a monastery and threatened to leave the Metropolitan's throne. Ivan, realizing the prelate's popularity, sought a reconciliation, sending his son to ask forgiveness. The Metropolitan refused to receive any messenger and insisted that the Tsar must come in person to beg his pardon. The dispute ended with Ivan's humble acknowledgement that he had been in the wrong, and Gerontius held the post until his death in 1489.

Perhaps it was his uncomfortable experience with a Metropolitan who refused to bow to the will of the Grand Prince, which led Ivan to take into his own hands the choice of a successor to Gerontius. The experiment turned out badly. We read of his personal appointment of one Zosimus, a monk of rather uncertain reputation who was later discovered to be a secret adherent of a heretical sect arising in Lithuania and ascribed to a Hebrew named Zachariah. The existence of this "Jewish" heresy had already been causing great concern to many leading churchmen, and when it was discovered that the new Metropolitan, purely a creature of the Tsar and enthroned without the concurrence of a synod, was connected with the destructive doctrine, consternation passed all bounds. Zosimus appointed two of his fellow heretics to deaneries in Moskow and then the wrath of the Church broke about his head. Vigorous representation to the Tsar by Gennadius, Bishop of Novgorod and Joseph of Volokolamsk, soon to become famous as the fiery orator-defender of the faith, caused the convocation of a synod which anathematized and imprisoned the less prominent of the offenders. Zosimus himself

was deposed and immured in a monastery. It is interesting to note that on his removal from office the published charge against him was intemperance: it would have been too scandalous a thing to have the people know that a Metropolitan had been a heretic.

The next Metropolitan, Simon, was duly elected by a council of bishops and the Grand Prince, as though to atone for his error in the choosing of Zosimus, showed him special honor at the time of his consecration. The authority of the Church was vindicated.

In Ivan's wars with Lithuania, we have another example of the Church's strong influence in state affairs. Hitherto the western boundaries of the Grand Princes had not extended far beyond Moskow. Beyond were the territories of a separate Metropolitanate, nominally centered at Kiev, but to the Russians suspiciously under the influence of Rome. A first clash of arms resulted in a peace treaty sealed by the marriage of Ivan's daughter to the Polish Prince. When the marriage was arranged Ivan stipulated that his daughter should under no circumstance change her religion, even though her husband's country was Catholic. She must have her own Orthodox chapel and chaplains and be free in every way to worship according to her own faith. Alleged violations of these conditions were seized upon as pretext for a new war in which the chief battle-cry was that Orthodox Moskow must rescue other Russians from the Catholic yoke. The war, of course, had the support of the Church and when it resulted in new accessions of territory the victory merely strengthened the prevalent conviction that the Church's interests and those of the Russian people were identical.

Rome and Moskow come into a slightly different relationship a few years later, in the marriage of Ivan to Sophia Palaeologus, of the last imperial house of Constantinople. Two of her uncles had occupied the Byzantine throne, the second losing his life in the last

hopeless defense of the city when the Turks captured it in 1453. Her father, on his deathbed, had made Sophia the ward of the Pope Alexander VI, who saw in the plan of her marriage with Ivan an opportunity to reopen the question of unity between Orthodox and Catholic which the Muscovites had so decisively renounced when Isidore came back from the Council of Florence.

Ivan and his advisers met the proposal with enthusiasm. To be allied with a name so mighty in the history of Orthodoxy as Palaeologus could only be pleasing to the Russian Tsar. The marriage was speedily arranged. Sophia, dowered by the Pope, was met in state as she came into Pskov and other Russian towns on her way to Moskow. But although she came from Rome, her whole powerful influence in the next thirty years of Russian history was always distinctly Greek. With her came Greek artisans and statesmen, theologians and architects. She brought the ancient Greek manuscripts which formed the foundation of the Library of the Patriarchs. It was doubtless the influence of Sophia which caused Ivan's resumption of relations with other European courts, and embassies were exchanged with Austria and Hungary, with the Pope and even with the Sultans at Constantinople. Probably the best monuments extant today, of the new international affiliations of Russia at this period, are the Assumption Cathedral in the Kremlin and some of the tower-gates of that fortress itself, the work of Aristotle Fioraventi of Bolonga, the Italian engineer and architect who built Ivan's churches, planned his military campaigns and was master of his artillery.

The story of Fioraventi's coming into Moskow is an interesting commentary on the status of the arts in Russia. Buildings of stone were not very commonly undertaken, but it had been decided to replace the small church of the Assumption by a structure on

the same site which should be more worthy the dignity of the Metropolitan's throne. The work was first undertaken by Russian workmen who dug the trenches for the new foundation in a great quadrangle around the old church, intending to leave its walls and the relics of many saints intact until the new building should be complete. The new walls rose slowly but seemed quite firm until the masons began to draw in the arches for the cupolas, when the whole fabric collapsed. The old chronicler naively explains that the Russian artisans' work was good — even foreign masons who came later praised its smoothness — but the Russians had not put enough lime with their sand to make a good cement. At any rate, the Grand Prince despaired of completing the building with only Russian talent, and his Consul to Venice sent Fioraventi who successfully constructed the building and witnessed its dedication in 1479.

There it stands to this day, the epitome of the history of Orthodoxy for twenty generations; Russia's Westminster Abbey, its dim square vaults upheld by tiers of pictured heroes and prophets on the round pillars which might well have come from some Egyptian temple, as clearly symbolic of the eastern origin of the faith it enshrines as is the Gothic of its western counterpart. The stiff Byzantine saints which look down from golden glories on its walls as truly mirror the Russian religious ideals of those times, as the life and color of Botticelli or Da Vinci reflect the culture of the contemporary West. Scarcely an event in Moskow's history is not commemorated in these walls. Here were crowned every one of the Romanov Tsars. Here Napoleon's troopers stabled their horses, and the half-ton of silver in the great chandelier was recovered from his retreating army. Here was the seat of the Russian Patriarchs and here those holy men lie buried. These walls have witnessed saintly lives and heroic martyrdoms. Here the holiest ikons and

the richest relics have been preserved for the faithful through all succeeding centuries. And in this great room men have gathered for a Christian service of worship, every Sabbath for near five hundred years.

Under Ivan's son Vasili who succeeded him on the throne, the Russian territory continued to expand. The monarchy increased in strength with its enlarging domain, and we note with interest the new importance of Russia's diplomatic relations with the west. These really dated from the entrance of Sophia into Moskow and resulted in strengthening the conviction that the Russian princes were the spiritual heirs of the Emperors of Byzantium. Vasili consciously emphasized that tradition. His court was barbaric in its magnificence; hundreds of horsemen accompanied him when he rode out. Court ceremonial and household expenditures were alike splendid, and the many distinguished West European delegates to Vasili's court were astounded at the luxury there displayed. These ambassadors came from all the European kings save those of France and England. Suleiman the Magnificent and Barber, Emperor of India, sought Vasili's friendship. Russia was again approaching a stage where she could be a vital part of world diplomacy.

In connection with this new westward-looking tendency, we read of the chief ecclesiastical character in Russia during Vasili's reign: Maxim, surnamed by the Russians "The Greek". In a search for a capable translator to render into Slavonic the store of Greek manuscripts which had accumulated in the Miracle Monastery in the Kremlin, Vasili despatched messengers to the monasteries of Mount Athos begging that a suitable man be sent to Moskow. Although he had spent years at Mount Athos, Maxim entered Russia almost as a direct representative of the best contemporary culture of Italy, for most of his many years of study had been spent in that country, the center, after the fall of Constantinople, of all the classicism

which had been the glory of Greece and Byzantium. In Italy he had known and admired Savonarola, whose martyrdom in Florence he had witnessed, and he wrote in the highest praise of the great Italian's heroism. Maxim's own life was to bear many likenesses to that of his martyr friend.

Because he was unacquainted with the Slavonic tongue, all Maxim's work of translation had to be done through other interpreters. He turned the old Greek Psalter into Latin and his two assistants retranslated into Slavonic. The fidelity with which Maxim went about his task could not but make enemies among the Russian clergy, as well as friends, and there was no small amount of complaint at the changes the foreigner insisted should be introduced into the old church books, products of four centuries of uncultured copyists. When at the end of a year and a half the task for which he had come to Moskow was finished, Maxim craved the Tsar's permission to return to Mount Athos, but instead of being permitted to depart, found himself faced with a new task of translation and annotation which would require several years. Maxim accepted the commission and postponed his longed-for return to his monastery.

A disciple of Savonarola's, however, could not live in Moskow and witness the low moral estate of Russian folk, their careful observance of the forms of religion and their woeful evasion of the real truths underlying those forms, without protesting. His plain speaking and his many treatises on the matter of public morals did not increase Maxim's friends. Neither did his participation in a heated controversy about monastic estates. And when, under a Metropolitan who had been his opponent in such a dispute, he dared publicly to criticise the Prelate for granting Vasili a divorce from his barren wife, he was promptly accused of heresy and mischievous alteration of the old church books and condemned to close confinement in a monas-

tery. There he stayed for twenty years, more than half of those years in a dungeon, meditating on the Tsar's generosity to those who came to serve him. And it was in a Russian monastery that he died, far removed from the holy Mountain he had longed for all through the years. His commentaries on the Scriptures formed the basis of Russian theology for a century. But although he had rendered a priceless service to the Russian Church, he had to undergo, like the Patriarch Nikon, four generations later, the penalty of that Church's suspicion that he had tampered with the unalterable and Orthodox faith.

Probably nothing could give a fairer representation of the fifty years which followed the death of Vasili Ivanovitch, than some such picture as that in the following paragraphs, of his son and successor whom the people of his own time knew as Ivan the Terrible. His real nature is still a subject of dispute among Russian historians, and his reputation variously assessed in unequal consideration of his monstrous cruelties and his kingly part in the historical development of Russia. Let us imagine ourselves in one of Moskow's churches, in the reign of Ivan.

It is even-song in the Cathedral of the Annunciation, in the Kremlin. And though the day has been one of horror, still the dim room is thronged with pale-faced worshippers, anxious in the solemnity of the vespers alike to forget the scenes of the afternoon and to pray for the tortured souls who have gone to meet their Maker. The Terrible Tsar has been making holiday. A score of men chosen through some freak of his displeasure have been sewn up in bear-skins and torn to bits by trained dogs, while the Tsar looked on and even with his own hand thrust a tentative dagger into quivering bodies to see if men were really dead. The people would have fled the scene, but the Tsar commanded their attendance and they

knew better than to disobey. Now, with the day's tragédy ended, Moskow prays in its churches.

A shudder runs through the crowd. In that little porch at the right of the altar-screen there appears a startling figure. With pale face and disheveled hair and his rich clothes still spotted with the blood of his murdered subjects, the Tsar too, has come to church. The service goes on and the most devout worshipper in the great room is outdone in prostrations and all the outward forms of devotion by the solitary devotee in the niche beside the altar-screen. In an agony of self-immolation he beats the agate pavement with his forehead; his blood-stained hands are incessant in the signing of the cross or the thumbing of his jewelled rosary. If never before, surely the Tsar repents him, now.

But the people have no such hope: it is no new thing for Ivan to come to church; neither are today's orgies of cruel murder new. Tomorrow may see another son forced as a prelude to his own execution to witness the beheading of his father, or a hundred more prisoners drowned in the river. Yet the Tsar prays in the niche as though naught save religion could find a place in his soul.

Only if we imagine ourselves living through some such experience, can we truly appreciate the condition of the State and the Church under this first Tsar of all the Russians. Ivan reigned for fifty years (1533—1584), the contemporary of the Borgias in Italy and of Queen Elizabeth in England. He is one of the most interesting studies in all Russian history. A kingly administrator and a ruthless autocrat; a pious supporter of the Church and the most abandoned of libertines; all the extremes the mind can picture seem bound up in the one man. He extended and consolidated all the Russian territory from the Soja in the west to unknown distances east of the Urals. The Tatar Khans were crushed into hopeless

inferiority, the laws of the Empire remodeled and improved. Under Ivan, Russia resumed its long broken relations as an equal of other European courts, and the period of the Renaissance is commemorated in Moskow by the churches and towers of the Kremlin, creations of masters who had seen service with the Medicis or Francis I. Ivan's reign is at once a glorious and a terrible landmark in the history of Russia. His career divides itself roughly into three periods.

Born late in the life of his father, he was left to the Regency of a most unusually temperamental mother when Vasili died. Upon the death of the Empress the boy was thrown upon the tender mercies of a corrupt court, torn with the secret and open intrigues of the nobles who composed it. Ivan, a weak, ill-tended boy, watched the criminality and treachery all about him and could not but contrast the usual contempt bestowed upon his uncomely person with the formal adulation and ceremony accorded him when he sat in audience or his signature was needed on some petition. Suddenly at the age of thirteen he assumed full power, himself, and two years later was solemnly crowned Tsar of all the Russias, the first Grand Prince to assume that official title. But he never recovered from the distrust and suspicion with which his boyhood had been surrounded; the lessons he had learned of crime and lust were too deeply impressed upon his mind ever to be entirely effaced.

In the year of his coronation a great fire, and a consequent tumult of the populace of Moskow which nearly cost him his life, marked the beginning of a second period in Ivan's reign. He suddenly put himself into the hands of two apparently honest men, whose influence over the succeeding years is remarkable. One of these men was Adashev, a minor courtier, and the other was Sylvester, a monk. Under the wise guidance of these two advisors Ivan's affairs flourished. A new law code was issued; a church council produced

the famous "Hundred Chapters" of ecclesiastical rites and doctrine. In a series of wonderfully successful expeditions against the Tatars, Kazan was taken, then Astrakhan, and the Volga became a Russian river. At his court the Tsar received strangers who had come into his country from the shores of the White Sea, and who were astonished to learn that there they were in the domain of the Tsar of Moskow. The travellers were Chancellor and his companions. With later Englishmen who followed the trail Chancellor had blazed, Ivan sent back the first Russian Ambassador England ever knew. In response to the Tsar's desire printers came from abroad and the first printing press in Russia produced the Acts of the Apostles in the Slavonic tongue. In vivid contrast to other parts of his reign, Ivan appears here as a wise and prosperous monarch, extending the boundaries of his kingdom and bettering its laws both civil and ecclesiastical.

His participation in church affairs forms no small part of Ivan's policy. In every period of his variegated career his interest in and knowledge of the religious forces of his time are manifest. The title he assumed as a youth at his coronation probably reflects the fact that his ill-directed reading had embraced largely church books. "Tsar" is the Slavonic word which named all the kings in Bible history: the Tsar Pharaoh, the Tsar David, — even the Heavenly Tsar, were terms with which he was familiar. If then, as his predecessors had believed, he was the direct inheritor through his grandmother Sophia Palaeologus, of the majesty of Byzantium, it was but natural that he should adopt for himself the most imperial title he knew.

Ivan's expedition against the Tatar capital of Kazan is another example of his fondness for religious formalities. The Russian Church historian Znamensky writes: "Kazan was surrounded to the ac-

companiment of churchly rites and constant prayer, and the expedition had all the characteristics of a religious procession. On the 2nd of October (1552) Kazan was taken, after a terrible explosion under the walls which occurred just at the moment when the deacon in the camp-church pronounced the very significant words, 'And there shall be one flock and one Shepherd'. Upon the capture of the city the Tsar ordered the destruction of all its mosques and the erection of churches upon their sites. On the place where his holy banner with a picture of the Savior had stood during the storming of the city, Ivan himself laid the foundation for the Church of the Savior, on the very day of the victory". Again we see a conquest of the Tsar pictured as simply a victory of the true faith over the false.

On the Red Square just outside the Kremlin in Moskow stands the strange church of Vasili the Blessed, that weird combination of form and color, like the dream of some delirious genie made reality. Ivan ordered it built to celebrate the capture of Kazan, with one chapel, (and hence one of the queer bulbous domes) for each great day of the siege. Tradition relates how, when the church was finished, the Tsar asked the architect if he could produce another such a masterpiece and upon his affirmative reply, ordered the man blinded, but as Gerrare says, "it is unlikely that Ivan would have done anything so usual".

Now there begins what may be termed the third phase of the strange life of the Terrible Tsar. Apparently there is an elusive strain of insanity running through all the years from 1553 to the Monarch's death thirty years later. There is no need to record his excesses here: all the Russian histories are full of the gruesome tales. They are well summed up in a strange letter to the monks in the Monastery of St. Cyril, preserved to this day, in which Ivan asked prayers for the souls of his victims: "Kazar Dubrovski

and his two sons, with ten men who came to their aid" — "Twenty men of the village of Kolomenskoe" — in all more than three thousand persons are mentioned, only a third of them by name.

It was in this period that Ivan offered to put away his sixth wife, but a few months after her wedding, and marry Queen Elizabeth of England. At the same time he proposed to her an agreement whereby each sovereign would guarantee asylum to the other in case revolution should make flight necessary. Elizabeth found "by the grace of God, no danger of the sort in her dominions", but promised Ivan a shelter and "freedom to worship as he chose", as had been requested.

The state of the Church under Ivan the Terrible can well be pictured in the story of the Metropolitan Philip II, revered today throughout all Russia as a saint. About the time the Tsar entered the third stage of his tumultuous reign, with the country at the licentious disposal of his Familiars, "Opritchniki", the Metropolitan's throne became vacant and against his protests, the old Archbishop of Kazan, Germanus, was selected to fill the position. Before his consecration he sought an interview with the Tsar at which he demanded in the name of justice, the disbanding of the reckless bodyguard which was terrorizing the country. In a passion, Ivan drove him from Moskow, and called from his retreat in the Solovetski Monastery its Abbot, Philip, an acquaintance of his boyhood whose famed piety seems to have had a strange fascination for the Tsar. The old man wept as he gave up his quiet life, but at the urgent representations of all the clergy, fearlessly assumed the new and difficult role. He seems to have thought his position as Metropolitan would give him some influence over the lawless Tsar and for a time contented himself with private remonstrance. A new wave of crime and outrage perpetrated by Ivan and his "Opritchniki" made it evident that

Philip's protests were unavailing, and he decided to take public action.

One day, after some new excesses, the Tsar with his bodyguard, all in masquerade costumes, came into the Assumption Cathedral, where Philip was attending the Liturgy. Approaching the Metropolitan, the Tsar bowed his head to receive a blessing. Philip fixing his eyes on the ikon of the Savior, ignored the visitor. A second time and a third, Ivan approached and finally one of his guard roughly jogged the Metropolitan's elbow: "The Tsar asks your blessing, Father".

"I do not recognize the Tzar in such a dress", the old man answered, "Neither do I recognize him in the acts of his government. Beware of the Judgments of God, O Tsar. Here we are offering Him the bloodless sacrifice, and behind the altar there flows the blood of innocent men".

The Tsar's rage nearly choked him. The famous iron staff banged on the Cathedral pavement as Ivan spat forth threats of violence. Calmly the Metropolitan answered him: "I am a pilgrim on the earth", he said, "and I am ready to suffer for the truth. Where were my faith, if I kept silence?"

Vowing vengeance, the Tsar left the church. But his strange awe of the holy old man still restrained him from the violence toward which his companions urged him. He avoided meeting Philip, never seeing him except in church, where he often heard his crimes denounced. Another collision was inevitable, however, and it happened one day when a religious procession led by Philip encountered the Tsar and his followers out by the Maiden's Convent. One of Ivan's men kept his hat on in the presence of the holy pictures and Philip remonstrated with the Tsar. Quick as a flash, the man had his cap off and accused the Metropolitan of lying.

The incident seems to have given the Tsar a suggestion as to how he might rid himself of his accuser,

for he immediately called a council and ordered them to depose the Metropolitan. A former monk in Philip's monastery was bribed to give evidence against the character of the accused prelate, and sentence of deposition was passed. But this was not sufficiently vigorous for the evil-minded Tsar. Philip was ordered to celebrate a last Liturgy in the Assumption Cathedral. In the midst of the service, a crowd of Ivan's "Familiars" rushed into the church, tore from him the sacerdotal robes, and hustled him off to prison.

He was confined in a monastery in Tver, where a year later the Tsar, passing the place, sent his henchman Skutarov to strangle him. One of the most striking pictures in the Alexander Gallery of Russian art in Petrograd is entitled "The Last Moments of the Metropolitan Philip." In a dark cell, the weary old man clad in the garb of a monk, kneels before the Gospels and a great Byzantine ikon of the Savior. The light from his countenance seems to be more than merely a reflection of the taper he holds to aid his reading. With lifted eyes, he is praying over his Book, as through the open door behind him there appears the uncouth form of his assassin.

The two successors of Philip in the Metropolitanate were mere creatures of the Tsar's will. None dared cross him, and only his death a score of years later relieved the people and the church alike of an incredible tyranny. The Church was having a foretaste of the iron control in its affairs by the State, which began with Peter and continued to the Revolution. Metropolitans were made and unmade at the will of the Tsars. Six out of the last ten Metropolitans of Moskow before the institution of the Patriarchate were removed from office before their deaths — not all, but most of them, as a result of the Tsar's displeasure. It was a time of trouble for Church and State alike, but a time of growth and strengthened power as well. A few other excerpts

from the church history of that time will make more vivid the condition of religion and culture in general.

At the request of the Tsar, Hans the Bookbinder came in from Denmark to set up a printing press; but he seems to have stayed only long enough to instruct the natives in his art. In front of the Kremlin wall in Moskow there is a statue of the Deacon Feodorov, the first Russian to print a Russian book, holding in his hands the proofs of the Acts of the Apostles, printed in 1564. Two years later the "Book of the Hours" appeared and then printing was interrupted by an uprising against the innovation. The real cause of this disturbance was probably the jealousy of the guild of copyists who saw their means of livelihood threatened. It was easy to raise a charge of alteration of the old books, however, and the printers were driven out of the city and their establishment with all of its equipment burned. A few years later, under the express protection of the Tsar, the art of printing was again introduced into Moskow and continued unmolested.

The whole period presents a strange contrast between the increasingly careful fulfillment of all the forms of the religion the people held, and the naive evasions of the morals of true Christianity. Travellers in Russia speak of the countless shrines and churches, how every corner has its holy pictures and how all the people salute them as they pass. All the customs of society and the relationships between members of the family bore the outward forms of religion. Even the Tsar's retreat at Alexandrovskoe Sloboda where he lived a life of the most shameless license, was patterned after a monastic establishment, (in jest or earnest, it is hard to say, in view of the strange contrasts in Ivan's character) with the Opritchniki as the brothers and Ivan as Prior. The worth of prayers was assessed by the number of prostrations which accompanied them; a man's true Christian zeal, by the amount he gave to churches and monasteries. Pilgrimages to holy places

increased almost beyond measure. Yet public morals were on a very low plane. The old church records reveal protests against the communal orgies with which the people of a town were wont to celebrate the holiday of John the Baptist, at the summer solstice. Other church holidays were the occasion for bestial excesses, following the formal religious celebrations. It is illuminating to read in the records of the Church Council of 1503, called to reform the morals of the Church, the pronouncement that monks and nuns shall not live in the same monastery, or that it is forbidden to a priest to celebrate the Liturgy on the day after he has been intoxicated. This council also passed a regulation which has been in practical effect ever since, that a widowed priest shall not continue to serve in a parish church but should enter a monastery.

Another most vivid presentation of the state of society of those times is found in the "Domostroi", or "Household Regulations", issued by Sylvester, archpriest in one of the great churches and confidant of Ivan the Terrible in the early part of his reign, a document in which its pious author carefully lays down the prescription for all the phases of Russian family life, beginning with religious observances and continuing through cookery receipts into the most insignificant details of home experience. The father is the absolute head of the household; children and wife alike are subject alone to his will. He must not permit laughter or merrimaking, when he is with them. He is assured that his family, like his slaves, will learn only by the application of the rod. When he must beat his wife, however, Sylvester urges him to do it in private and as gently as possible, that the family difficulties may not be too patent to the community. The wife must be skilled in all the household arts and be the first among the servants. She should rise in the morning and awaken the other servitors of the house. Her whole life is to be limited to the care of the house and children,

whose morals are not her responsibility but the father's. If by rare chance she has any time free from labor she should spend it in prayer before the ikons.

Through all this period of Russian life there runs a profound attachment to the forms of religion, and primarily those forms which have been hallowed by their inheritance from older times. A hot dispute broke out in the Church, initiated by the violent protest of a priest against what he called wicked innovations in the painting of ikons on the altar-screen of the Cathedral of the Annunciation, in the Kremlin. Slight changes had been made, it was charged, in the historic methods of representing some of the saints. It was this period too, which developed and tolerated the curious habit of performing all parts of the service at once. It was common conviction that no part of the old ritual, however insignificant, might properly be left out of the church service. But if all the historic Liturgy in the full form it had come down to them, with all its additions and alterations, were to be said at length the people must wait in the church for half a day at a time. In an effort to shorten the time required for the service and still perform all that was written in the service books, the custom grew of having the Deacon and the Priest and the choir, beginning all at once, sing or recite their own parts of the service straight through the book, regardless of the vociferations of each other. And the babel of Litany and Epistle and choral music all at once must have been strange indeed, if not edifying, but truly illustrative of the ideals of the time. Had not every word of the Liturgy been said or sung? And the people needed to remain in church but an hour or two!

The Church of this period just preceding the Patriarchate presented a curiously conglomerate picture. Closely bound up with the influence of the state authority which rapidly increased in power, the Church found itself, too, growing in wealth and influence. The

concentration of civil authority in Moskow removed the possibility of the superior elevation of ecclesiastical leaders in other Russian cities and increased the prestige of the Metropolitan. The Church's rapid increase in wealth was mirrored in the hundreds of new churches and shrines which enriched every city, as well as in imperial edicts limiting the acquisition of further estates by the monasteries. A veneration for the forms of religious observance which had been passed down from the fathers had led the Russians into an almost superstitious observance of rite, scrupulous and exacting, with the real spirit it should have represented often so obscured as almost to be lost in persisting paganism. With many of its people serving the letter more than the spirit, subject to the whim of autocratic rulers, following customs and observances so primitive as almost to be pagan instead of Christian, still the Church of this period produced men like Joseph of Volokolamsk, vivid orator and defender of the true faith, and the deacon John Feodorov, first printer in the Russian empire. The Church gave birth to heroes like Philip, daring the anger of the Terrible Tsar and facing unimaginable suffering rather than be silent in the face of wrong. Elemental and primitive, yes; so are passion for the truth and the fearlessness which prefers to face death rather than countenance evil. Beneath this surface of religious observance there may lie woeful unenlightenment, but there are depths as well, of the soundest Christian character; pure gold gleaming out from baser ore. Test it by the fire of oppression or persecution, and its true worth shines forth. The faith of the martyr-centuries still lives in Russia.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TEN PATRIARCHS.

When Ivan the Terrible died in 1584 he left the throne to a son, Feodor, as unlike his father as day is unlike night. A mild, almost subnormal youth, he allowed the council of nobles attached to his court to manage affairs of state, with the chief power first in the hands of his uncle Nikita Romanov, and then upon his death under the control of Boris Godunov, whose meteoric career must now be described. Irene, Boris's sister, was the wife of Feodor, and her influence had aroused in his heart the ambition to be himself Tsar. There is a well founded tradition that some sorcerers had told Boris he should one day be Tsar, but that his reign would last only seven years, a prediction the noble set out to fulfil. Using his early influence at court to strengthen his position, he caused all rival ministers to be banished or imprisoned, and even persuaded the Tsar to send away to an estate at Uglitch, the only other son of Ivan the Terrible, a small boy named Dmitri, with his mother, Ivan's seventh wife.

Thenceforth Boris was virtually Tsar, and the other events in Feodor's reign are doubtless chiefly, if not entirely, attributable to him. The most significant occurrence in Church affairs was the establishment of the Patriarchate in Moskow. This new arrangement was a natural outgrowth of the rising power of Russia, coupled with the now well-established theory of Moskow as the third Rome. Russians, clergy and laymen, maintained that it was beneath the dignity of the greatest Church in Eastern Christendom to pay allegiance to a Patriarch who was himself the subject of an Infidel

Sultan in Constantinople. Besides this, Boris had a special interest in the creation of a supreme ecclesiastical authority. He foresaw that the death of Feodor would leave none but the child Dmitri between himself and the throne on which he had set his eyes, and although Dmitri's relatives waited in enforced retirement for a day of revenge on Boris, he believed the prestige of the Church on his side would be sufficiently powerful to assure his own coronation.

So in 1586, when for the first time in history an Eastern Patriarch, Joachim of Antioch, came to Russia seeking support for the churches oppressed by Islam, it was suggested that he authorize the institution of a fifth Patriarchate in Moskow. Joachim decided he had no right to establish a new Patriarchal throne, upon his own authority. Before leaving for the East, however, he promised to present the plan for the consideration of an Eastern Church council.

Two years later, Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople came to Moskow, also "in quest of alms", and the proposal for a Russian Patriarchate was pressed more vigorously. At first it was suggested that Jeremiah himself should become Patriarch of Russia, and the plan might have succeeded if Boris had not been so attached to his friend Job, Metropolitan of Moskow, as to be unwilling to have a superior dignitary in the same city with him. Hence he proposed that Jeremiah, as Patriarch of Russia, should have his official residence at Novgorod which, it was now conveniently recalled, was the earlier Church capital. This idea displeased Jeremiah, who declined the offer, but consented to consecrate Job as Patriarch. In an appendix to his Church History, Muraviev gives a contemporary account of the whole visit of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, recording with interesting detail all the ceremonial visits, addresses and court functions which attended the establishment of Moskow as a Patriarchate. The Russians were very jealous for the complete

equality of their newly-appointed Prelate, and the old chronicler relates how Job was instructed to stand only when Jeremiah did, to kiss him on the lips, instead of on the shoulder, and how after the ceremony of installation in the Assumption Cathedral, the two Patriarchs left the church by separate doors so that neither would have to give precedence to the other.

Another appendix to the same history relates at length how a year later (1590) a messenger came from Constantinople bringing formal confirmation of the new Patriarch, by a council of Eastern colleagues. The Patriarch of Moskow is to be the fifth of the Eastern Patriarchs (Rome is no longer considered), and rank next after Jerusalem. Znamensky points out that at the request of the Russian Government a second council of Patriarchs, including one who had been absent before, was held in Constantinople in 1593, and again confirmed the appointment of Job, giving Russian bishops the right to choose his successor.

This first Patriarch of Moskow was a real leader, a man of wide executive experience. He had been abbot in several monasteries, then Bishop of Rostov, from which position he had been elevated in 1587 to the Moskow Metropolitanate. His new position made very little immediate change in the general arrangement of Russian Church affairs. As Metropolitan he had been at the head of the Church; now the new dignity was compensated by raising four bishops to the rank of Metropolitan. A few minor matters of costume and ceremony, such as a cross on his white cowl, and the carrying of a candle before him in church procession, seem to have been the chief differences noticeable under the new regime. The real power of the Patriarchate developed later.

Now occurred an event which had in its train the gravest changes in Russian history of that generation. It was suddenly announced that the child Dmitri had died in the out-of-the-way village to which Boris had

succeeded in having his mother relegated. Popular suspicion immediately connected the name of Boris with the child's death, so that the Regent felt it necessary to send a commission to investigate the matter. The commission reported, gravely, that instead of having been murdered Dmitri had stabbed himself during a fit, and scandal was hushed for a time. The people, however, could never completely forget their suspicion that Boris had been guilty of the death of a Prince of the blood, son of Ivan the Terrible, a fact which later caused his own tragic overthrow. Seven years after, (1598) Feodor died, and the Rurik dynasty ended.

For a brief space after Feodor's death we have the curious circumstance of a great empire ruled by a nun. The widowed Queen, lamenting that in her barrenness the line had died out, took the veil immediately after her husband's death, and until a new ruler could be chosen, all state documents were signed in her name.

The nobles met and elected Boris, long the real ruler, to be the new Tsar. A bit of stage-play occurred here, similar to that in which Shakespeare pictured Richard III as receiving the crown. Boris, upon hearing of the decision of the nobles, suddenly went to stay with his sister in her retirement in the Convent of the Maidens. A delegation of nobles, headed by the Patriarch, came to offer him the crown. Boris refused, and a council of all the people was called, which confirmed the choice of the nobles. Again Boris declined the proffered honor, and consented to the acceptance of office only after his sister had "blessed him for the throne".

For a time Boris' reign seemed to prosper, but the deep-seated popular belief in a princely line proved his undoing. He was only a Boyar (noble); the people could not reverence him as a Tsar. Then, too, the death of a real prince was laid to his charge, and in spite of

all his attempt at good government, distrust and unrest spread. People began to whisper that the seven years predicted by the witches for Boris to reign were about ended. Famine and pestilence added to the uneasiness, and suddenly it was announced from the Polish border that the boy Dmitri had not been murdered, but was alive and marching on Moskow at the head of a Polish army.

Russian historians see in this appearance of a pretender to the throne of Moskow, an attempt by Rome to gain control of Russia. It is supposed that this "False Dmitri" was a renegade monk from Moskow, who conceived the idea of making himself Tsar by the aid of Papal influence and Polish arms. The Patriarch Job declared excommunicate all those who should support the pretender, but in spite of all the Church's effort, the uprising spread, and Russia saw the beginning of what the historians call the "Troublous Times". In a riot caused by the Polish advance, Boris died, whether or not by his own hand is uncertain. His death was followed by the surrender of Moskow to the Poles, and the first act of the false Tsar Dmitri was to seize the Patriarch in his Church and hustle him off to prison in a monastery, where he died two years later (1607).

In his place, Dmitri, on his own authority, appointed a bishop named Ignatius to be Patriarch, and in an effort to strengthen his control of the Church, he brought out of the monastery where Boris had forced him to take the vows, the boyar Feodor Romanov, now known as the monk Philaret, and destined to be the founder of a dynasty which ruled Russia for three hundred years. Philaret became Bishop of Rostov. He was later to become one of the greatest of the Patriarchs, practically a Tsar-coadjutor.

The false Dmitri enjoyed a troubled reign of only eleven months. Not the least factor in his overthrow was his alliance with Rome and the consequent intro-

duction of Jesuit schools and Roman Catholic services into Holy Moskow. People accused Ignatius, the pseudo-Patriarch, of Uniate tendencies, and discontent spread, eventually resolving the internal troubles into a clear contest between the Russians and the Poles; Orthodox against Catholic. An uprising in Moskow resulted in the murder of the Pretender and the flight of Ignatius.

Among the first events in the brief reign of the next occupant of the Russian throne, Prince Shuiski, was the election of Hermogen, Bishop of Kazan to be Patriarch (1606–1612). Almost at once he made himself and the Church of which he was head, a rallying point for the Russian struggle against the still threatening Poles. The six years following Hermogen's elevation are among the darkest in Russian history. Taking advantage of the popular discontent with Shuiski, Poland, Lithuania and Sweden all began to make inroads upon Russian territory. Again reports were spread that the child Dmitri had not died, but now there were two different pretenders to his identity, and disorder again began to spread, and a new Polish army appeared outside Moskow.

In all this disorder Hermogen appears as the one stable point around which Russian patriotism could organize. When a party of nobles decided to open the gates of Moskow to the Poles, the Patriarch refused his signature. When finally popular opinion compelled him to agree to a deputation asking the Polish Prince Vladislav to become Tsar, Hermogen made the delegates promise to insist upon Vladislav's acceptance of Orthodoxy. Among those delegates, it may be remarked in passing, was Philaret, father of the first of the Romanov Tsars, who with the rest of the embassy was cast into prison when war again broke out as the result of the Poles' refusal to agree to Hermogen's conditions. Letters went out from Moskow to all parts of Russia, urging a united front against a foreign, and Catholic, foe.

The Polish party in Moskow so feared Hermogen's leadership that he was confined, incommunicado, in the Miracle Monastery.

But the Patriarch's letters had accomplished their purpose. Although the Prelate was in prison, the monks in the Trinity Lavra took up the cause. Like many other rich monasteries, this historic cloister had contributed many thousand roubles for the equipment of a Russian army, even devoting some of the costly articles in its church museum for the purpose. With Moskow in Polish hands, the invaders had one great stronghold yet to conquer, and for sixteen months of desperate privation the Trinity Monastery with less than 2,500 defenders withstood a siege by Polish troops numbering at times 30,000 men. The Poles finally withdrew and the Monastery resolved itself into a huge hospital, caring for the thousands of war-stricken Russians who poured in from occupied districts. The Treasurer, Abraham Palitsin, made himself a name in Russian history by his fearless leadership among the Russian troops, and his offer of the most sacred treasures of the Monastery to pay for the services of Cossacks, who, refusing to accept the holy things, offered to fight without remuneration. Besides, the Monastery had become a new propaganda center. While some of the brothers were with the army, other monks sat in their cells, writing letters summoning all Russians to clear their land of its foes.

When one of these letters was read in Novgorod, it struck to the heart of Kosma Minin, a cattle dealer, and he took upon himself the leadership of the people. With him was associated Prince Pojarski, an experienced warrior who directed the preparations for an effective movement against the invaders. From his Moskow prison the Patriarch Hermogen sent a final blessing on the enterprise, just before his death, supposedly by starvation. The whole movement had a religious character. People devoted all their possessions to

the cause. Minin ordered a three days season of prayer, with fasting obligatory for all people, "even babes at the breast". Popular enthusiasm consisted of a mixture of patriotism and religious fervor; with the army as it went to relieve Moskow, marched bishops and monks with the holiest ikons. When in the final attack on the city walls, the Cossacks held back, it was the fiery oratory of the monk Palitsin which swung them into the assault. The Poles capitulated, and Moskow was again in the hands of the Orthodox.

The spirit which had been roused by Minin and Pojarski continued after the liberation of Moskow, developing into a great desire for unity and order. When an election was called in Moskow to which delegates came from nobles and churchmen and people alike, they agreed first of all that the new Tsar should not be a foreigner, and Russian spirit could find no better expression of its new power than the choice of Michael Romanov, (1613—1645), who although only a boy of fifteen, was still the next of kin of the old line of The Terrible, and whose father, the Metropolitan Philaret, was even then a prisoner in Poland. The new Tsar, naturally, was not a very powerful figure at first, although the whole good will of the people was united in his support. Within a few years, however, a new figure came on the scene in the person of the young Tsar's father, one of the two great Patriarchs of Moskow.

Since the death of Hermogen in 1612, the Patriarchal seat had been vacant, Church affairs being administered by different Metropolitans appointed for the purpose. Znamensky explains the failure to elect a Patriarch by the troubled state of the times as well as a common consent that the office should be given to the ex-noble Philaret, forced into a monastery by Boris Godunov, and released by the false Dmitri to become Metropolitan of Rostov. Philaret, however, was a prisoner with the Poles, and "did not wish that

for the purpose of gaining his freedom, one foot of Russian soil should be ceded to Poland". A truce with Poland in 1618 released all the chief prisoners, however, and upon Philaret's return to Moskow he was consecrated Patriarch by Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who happened to be visiting Russia.

Now there began a new era in the Patriarchate, when the authority of the Russian Prelate overshadowed even that of the civil powers. Philaret took upon himself the same title as his son the Tsar and both were addressed as "Great Lord", "Veliki Gosudar". As Znamensky says, "The Great Lord the Patriarch was the constant assistant and guide to the Great Lord the Tsar, in all governmental affairs". Philaret had not received much preparation in his youth for his ecclesiastical position, but his experience as a noble at the court of Ivan the Terrible had taught him the art of diplomacy, and the power of the Church as represented in its Patriarch, assumed superiority even over that of the State. He rapidly achieved a reputation as stern and domineering in State as in Church affairs, and it was whispered that even the Tsar trembled before him. Philaret lived in a palace as grand as that of his son. He renewed the shaken authority of the Church courts, and set a precedent for the complete coordination of State and Church government, such as was attempted but never again equalled in Russia.

Among the important events of this "joint reign" of the first Romanov Tsar and his father the Patriarch, was the founding of the Moskow Academy, existent to this day, though now located at the Trinity Monastery. For this purpose Philaret brought in foreign teachers of the sciences. Other foreigners came too, merchants from France and England in greater numbers than ever before, and we read of protests to the throne from Moskow tradesmen urging careful control upon this stream of immigration. Another notable feature of the period is the spread of Christianity in Siberia;

during the reign of Michael, the first episcopal see, that of Tobolsk (1620) was established, and monasteries were founded as far east as the Amur basin.

Philaret's death in 1633 brought to a close a period of coordinate authority for the heads of Church and State, which is probably unmatched in history. The Patriarch's office attained a rank equal to that of the Tsar himself and the Church's position in State relationships was almost that of master, instead of subject.

Following Philaret, the next two occupants of the Patriarchal throne, men less eminent and vigorous, are significant chiefly for permitting the power of their office to decline. The first, Joasaf I (1634—1640) was "of a kindly nature, but not bold with the Tsar", as an old chronicle has it. He neither sought nor received the title of "Veliki Gosudar", and took no part in the affairs of State.

Michael's experience with his masterly father had taught him the perils of an autocrat, if the Church authority was allowed to assert itself. The young Tsar had also learned at the same source the art of being an autocrat, and he began to exhibit his capacities, in the time of the second Patriarch after his father, Joseph (1642—1652). The first attack was made upon the rights of monasteries to hold large estates. The rapidly growing wealth of the Church, supposed at this time to have embraced one-third of all the land, together with its right to maintain special courts for all cases involving clerical persons, became increasingly disagreeable to the Throne. The Church historian Znamensky writes several pages of criticism against Joseph, for his failure to ward off the Tsar's attempts to limit the powers of the Church. The fault probably lay in the times rather than in the Patriarch, for after the death of Michael, his son, Alexis continued the process of increasing the authority of the Tsar at the expense of that of the Church. The famous "Monastirski Preekaz", "Monastery Order", removed authority in Church affairs from an ecclesiastical to a civil court,

thus further reducing the power of the Church, and especially that of the Patriarch. Joseph died in 1652, and in his place appeared the most striking character in all the hundred years of the Moskow Patriarchate.

The Patriarch Nikon has been called the Thomas a'Becket of Russian Orthodoxy. Prominent alike in Church and State affairs, he was a storm center in both. In him we see the only attempt in all Russian history to assert the superiority of ecclesiastical over civil authority, an attempt he prosecuted with such skill and such scholastic ability that some writers have been inclined to think he must have been supported from the Latin Church of the West. There is absolutely no basis for this suggestion, yet Nikon's scholarly ability and his personal power make him an outstanding exception to the usual average of Russian prelates. The great authority which he claimed, and for a time actually exercised, led to the reduction of the power of the Patriarchate, and his wisest reforms caused a schism in his Church which persists to the present time.

He must have been an interesting personality. Large-framed and handsome, he became an early friend of the young Tsar Alexis. The friendship deepened, with the Tsar bestowing upon the churchman an ever-increasing share of his confidence, until the death of Joseph opened the way for Nikon's elevation to the Patriarchal throne.

This occurred under dramatic circumstances (1652). A man of Nikon's powerful personality could not accept an office with as little authority as had been exercised by the Patriarch just deceased, and when Nikon was informed of his election, he refused the office. Another council of nobles and people assembled before him in the Assumption Cathedral, and the Tsar himself on his knees begged his friend to accept the Patriarch's white cowl. Nikon exacted from all present a promise to regard him as father in all spiritual matters

and to assist him in the upbuilding of the Church, and only then agreed to take the Patriarchal seat.

For six years the most intimate friendship existed between Tsar and Patriarch. Nikon was called Tsar, even by Alexis, and a dual monarchy resulted, in every respect like that under Michael, save that now the Patriarch held his position by virtue of his office, instead of because he was the father of the Tsar. When the Tsar was absent at the wars, Nikon ruled in his stead, having himself placed in the field 10,000 soldiers from his own estates. He built great monasteries. The most famous of these is the New Jerusalem, outside Moskow, where he prepared a tomb for himself and where above his grave the visitor can see the fourteen-pound iron cross and chain which the Patriarch sentenced himself to wear as a penance. Nikon lived in a state equalling that of the Imperial palace, and this was one of the original causes of dissatisfaction among the clergy. Besides this he was not at all considerate of the feelings or even the rights of either clergy or nobles. Even as Metropolitan of Novgorod, it had been said of him "It were better to be exiled to Siberia than to come under Nikon's displeasure", and now with his new and practically unlimited authority, things went roughly for those who crossed his path. He caused corrections to be made in the church books and customs, which deeply offended the conservatives, and at the same time seized and burned church organs and pictures the nobles had brought in as samples of the more modern Western ideas. Intolerant alike toward conservatives and liberals, his enemies multiplied, and soon their influence with the Tsar began to cause strained relationships with the Patriarch. Nikon, on his part, refused to humble himself in the least before the Emperor, and the breach widened. One day, after a direct slight on the part of the Tsar, an attempt was made to have Alexis attend the Liturgy, where Nikon should celebrate

and reconciliation was hoped for. Enemies of the Patriarch prevented the Tsar from going to church, and at the close of the Liturgy, announcing to all present that he wished no longer to be Patriarch, Nikon divested himself of the Prelate's robes and retired to his monastery at New Jerusalem. From this retreat, however, he continued to send out letters as though he were still Patriarch, at the same time urging the election of his successor. Nikon seems to have expected a request from the Tsar and people that he should resume his seat, but instead he found himself quite left out of consideration. A council of Russian and visiting Greek clergy was called to decide what should be done. Nikon attacked the council most vigorously, calling names in truly flowery style, and capped the climax of his protestations by anathematizing Pitirim whom he himself had appointed to fill the Patriarch's office until a new election, because Pitirim had omitted mention of Nikon's name in the Liturgy. The affair continued in this vein for two more years, closing with Nikon's sudden reappearance in the Moskow Cathedral, a sort of test case, as it were, of the Tsar's real attitude toward him. Instead of offering reconciliation, Alexis asked him curtly to return to his monastery, and a council of the other four Eastern Patriarchs was called to consider his removal from office.

In 1666 Moskow witnessed a Church council such as had never occurred in the history of Russia. In the presence of the Tsar and his nobles, two of the Eastern Patriarchs, with delegate powers from the other two, sat in conference with ten Metropolitans and a great number of other church dignitaries, to decide the fate of the tumultuous Russian Prelate. Nikon was called to face the council. He came in his Patriarchal robes, and finding no seat prepared for him with the other Patriarchs, remained standing facing his accusers for the ten hours the trial lasted. His retirement had not dulled his tongue. Nikon's vitriolic defense spared not

even the person of the Tsar. The council found him guilty of "Deposing Russian Bishops without trial", of deserting his Patriarchal throne, and of using violent language against his opponents and against the Church. He was reduced to the rank of a simple monk and condemned to immediate imprisonment in a monastery. The other Patriarchs themselves removed his mitre and jewelled insignia, and as they did so Nikon found opportunity to heckle his accusers: "Divide the jewels among yourselves", he taunted them, "you will have a little more with which to pay tribute to the Sultan."

For the next fifteen years Nikon lived in the most severe confinement in various monasteries. Another Tsar, Feodor Alexeevitch, desired to lighten his imprisonment and issued permission for the old man to return to his own monastery at New Jerusalem, but he died on the way, amid the most affecting reverence of the populace. The Tsar acted as pall-bearer at his funeral, every honor being shown the deceased, and a little later at the Tsar's request letters came from the Eastern Patriarchs removing the condemnation of the Council of 1666 and restoring to Nikon his title of Patriarch.

The Tsar had had a lesson in Nikon's powerful influence in state affairs, so shortly after the council which deposed the Patriarch another was held (1667), really a continuation of the same assembly, which passed new laws regarding Church and State. Among other decrees of this council, we read: "The Patriarch must not bear the title Veliki Gosudar, or interfere in civil affairs". Henceforth the Church was never to challenge the right of the State. More, the way was paved for the abolition of the Patriarchate.

One other most important phase of Nikon's activity must be noted. It was remarked above that he interested himself greatly in the reform of the church service and the correction of church books. Only long acquaintance with the Russians' tenacity to the faith of the fathers, in all of its exact details, can make clear

to a Western mind how shocking a thing to them it was to have any alteration in ancient church customs; to be told, for example, that it was correct to cross themselves with three fingers instead of two, as they and their fathers had done from times immemorial. Many serious departures from the originals had occurred in eight centuries of copying Slavonic books none too perfectly translated from the Greek in the first instance, and Nikon with characteristic thoroughness ordered many changes. The result was the first serious break in its unity which the Russian Church ever witnessed. Out of it grew the movement which has resulted in the almost countless number of sects in Russia of today.

The subject is too large to be treated here. Leroy-Beaulieu gives more than one-third of his whole six hundred pages on Russian religion, to a very careful and interesting discussion of the sects. They offer a fascinating study of religious psychology as well as of the national temperament of Russia. The story of the hot disputes about the sects and the heroic defence of what men regarded as the true faith, contains more striking episodes than almost any other section of Russian history. These pages have space for only the briefest outline of the origin and progress of the "Raskol", ("Dissent"), under the Patriarchate.

Popular distrust of the reforms ordered by Nikon was fanned into a flame of frenzy by his personal enemies. It resulted in violent protests against the new customs, accusations that Nikon was "Antichrist", and even in political disorders, for the same government and the same council which had deposed their author, supported the reforms themselves. The government took repressive measures, which resulted in merely strengthening popular discontent. The movement found its first center in the Solovetsky Monastery, and the Tsar's troops had to besiege it for eight years before it was taken and the dissenters punished.

The movement grew until it threatened to divide the kingdom. Under the regency of Sophia a riot amounting almost to a rebellion arose in Moskow itself and the Princess was forced to intervene. A debate was arranged between the two parties, those who clung to the old customs and those in agreement with Nikon and the council. One of the most striking paintings in the Alexander Gallery in Petrograd was a picture of this debate, which rose to such fury as to threaten with physical violence even the royal personages present. As a result, in 1685 the "Raskol" was absolutely forbidden throughout the country and the death penalty laid upon those who refused to give up their old rites. For a generation the persecution continued with the usual success of religious oppression. To the present time the "Sects" exist in Russia, an original outgrowth of the reforms of Nikon.

The Raskol soon broke into two parts over the question of a priesthood. The dissenting priests had been executed or imprisoned or degraded. Some of the dissenters sought by bribes or other means to attract substitutes from the established Church while another party held a priesthood entirely unnecessary for their worship. Hence there arose the names for the two great divisions of the Raskol: The "Popovtsi" ("Hierarchists"), and the "Bez-Popovtsi" ("Without clergy").

These two divisions, in turn, have divided and subdivided into all sorts of religious form or chaos and the end is not yet. For a complete study of the subject the reader is referred to Leroy-Beaulieu, volume III, where, as has been said, the matter is most fully treated. In general, the schism became a protest against all innovation, national and civil as well as ecclesiastical. It is interesting to note the curious inversion here, of the Protestant Reformation. There, the schismatics stood for reform; in Russia the established Church supported the innovations, and the schism was a protest against it.

Later generations saw the removal of the oppression to which the Raskol was subject, and some of the finest churches in Russian cities today are those of certain groups of the "Popovtsi". The other half of the dissent, however, has wandered into all sorts of excesses and outré notions, until there seems to be no limit to the curious happenings which can be called religion. Before the Revolution there were listed more than 300 separate sects. Altogether in Russia today, the dissenters from the Orthodox Church who still lay claim to the Christian name probably number about fifteen million.

Nikon was followed in the Patriarchate by two men of quite negligible significance. They were Joasaf II (1666—1672) and Pitirim, who occupied the throne but ten months. Joachim, (1674—1690) the third in line after Nikon, was more worthy to be his successor and made several successful attempts to protect the ancient ecclesiastical rights of special courts and the privilege of holding estates, from the increasing encroachment of imperial power. His efforts possibly hindered, but they could not stop the tendency of the times, and his last years were sadly disturbed by the accession of Peter the Great, with his boundless energy and his ambition to be the one authority in his Empire.

One event occurring under the Patriarchate of Joachim is worthy of notice. In 1687 a council of the Eastern Patriarchs recognized the Metropolitanate of Kiev as dependent upon the Patriarchate of Moskow. The long division of Russia into two Metropolitanates was finished. The reconciliation resulted from a developing rapprochement, dating almost from the separation between the Metropolitanates of Little Russia and White Russia, in 1461. Regardless of their political servitude, the common people of the Kiev district had always held tenaciously to their preference for Orthodoxy instead of some form of Uniate confession. Begin-

ning with 1648, a series of upheavals, religious as well as political, had restored one part of South-West Russia after another, to connection with the Orthodoxy of Moskow. The peace with Poland in 1687 made the way clear for Joachim, the Patriarch in Moskow, to appoint a new Metropolitan of Kiev. His appointee was recognized by the other Patriarchs, and after two and one-half centuries of division the Russian land became united under the leadership of a Russian Patriarch.

The Patriarchal office itself, however, was not destined to last much longer. After Joachim's death in 1690 the Metropolitan of Kazan, Adrian, was elected Patriarch. His one outstanding act occurred in the early part of his ten years reign, when he issued an encyclical protesting vigorously against the modern ideas being introduced from the West, such as the use of tobacco, and the custom of shaving the beard. As Western ideas formed a prominent part in the program of the energetic young Tsar Peter, Adrian came immediately under suspicion, and the rest of his life seems to have been spent in inconspicuous retirement. Peter went about his herculean task of pulling Russia by the collar through two centuries of progress in a single generation, in order to catch up with the rest of Europe, and the Church as well as every other Russian institution felt his hand. In 1700 Adrian died. Peter already had designs on the power which rested in the Church, and through his influence the election of a new Patriarch was "postponed". It never took place, and until the Revolution of 1917 broke the power of the Tsar over nation and Church alike, Russian Church affairs were managed by the Holy Synod.

These one hundred years and more of the Patriarchate in Russia, (1589—1700) present a composite of strongly contrasting light and shade. Job, the first Patriarch, is installed as a natural outgrowth of the supremacy of Russia among Orthodox nations

and churches. The "troublous times" give rise to Hermogen, who in six brief years of authority succeeded in initiating a movement which united all Russia in real patriotism. Then under Philaret there begins the remarkable co-sovereignty of Tsar and Patriarch, when Church authority sat side by side with that of the State. A brief decline of the Patriarchal power under two men of small capacity is followed by the great revival under Nikon, when the Church dared to claim supremacy over the State and its rulers. What might have happened had the Church at large supported its vigorous head, can only be conjectured, but assailed by enemies among clergy and nobility alike, Nikon's light was crushed out in a monastery prison, and the three other men who succeeded him before the office was abolished, were of small significance. Henceforth for two hundred years the Church was to be a captive, its hierarchy compelled to serve the autocratic Tsars.

CHAPTER VII.

THE HOLY SYNOD.

A pious German theologian, writing in 1745 to the Princess who was to become the Russian Empress Catherine II said: "The Russian religion, as established and purified by the most glorious Peter, closely approaches Lutheranism". While that is true in no very large sense, there is no doubt that Peter's establishment of the Holy Synod, the most important act of interference in Church matters upon which the Tsar ever ventured, was part and parcel with his other governmental schemes, all modelled after what he had studied in other European, chiefly Protestant, countries. In his zeal to make everything new and all on the same pattern, he included the management of Church affairs in a system of "Colleges" which should direct the affairs of Law, the Military, and the like. The original title given the Holy Synod, was "Ecclesiastical College". It was to replace the direction of one man with that of a group.

But this idea of government by colleges was not the prime reason for Peter's establishment of the Synod. An absolute autocrat could not risk the presence of another dignitary like the Patriarch. In the Preamble to the Ecclesiastical code, which Peter made all the Bishops sign, we read: "The people, in their simplicity, do not perceive in what manner the ecclesiastical power differs from the autocratic. Dazzled by the exalted dignity and the pomp of the supreme pastor of the Church, they imagine that so great a personage is another sovereign, the equal of the autocrat, if not superior to him; they look on the ecclesiastical order as on another and better State". The people "have

come to consider in all things, less the autocrat than the supreme pastor, even to the extent of siding with the latter against the former, in the idle fancy that they were upholding the cause of God Himself". Himself the great grandson of a Patriarch, Peter remembered the difficulties his father had had with the domineering Nikon, and he desired to remove forever any danger of possible future complications.

This danger was not altogether a matter of the future. Almost all the higher officials of the Church were opposed, openly or in secret, to the Western reforms which Peter was bent on piling upon an uncomprehending and breathless people. Even a progressive bishop like Metrophan of Voronezh, who had given his money and his blessing to aid Peter construct a fleet for war against the Turks, coming one day to visit the Tsar was so shocked by the Greek statuary, "heathen gods" he called them, in Peter's courtyard, that he refused to enter. Later, the death of Peter's son Alexis was brought about by the discovery of a vast secret plot supported by the reactionary religious forces, to abandon the Tsar's new capital and to return to Moskow with all its Russian customs, once the energetic Monarch himself should have passed from life, an event for whose hastening some of the clergy daily prayed before the holy ikons.

With such opinion current in the Church and threatening the absolute will of the Tsar, Peter set about making plans for the removal of any danger from a powerful Patriarch. Upon the death of Adrian in 1700, Stephen Yavorski, a man of South Russian extraction whose oratorical powers had once attracted Peter's notice, and whom he had caused to be elevated with what the Church regarded as most unholy rapidity from the rank of a monk to that of Metropolitan, was placed as "Guardian" of the Church, pending the election of another prelate. Here again Peter's canniness asserted itself. With many of the old Russian

institutions he had made short shift, replacing some time-honored body or custom, overnight, with a completely new creation of his own. He seems to have realized, however, that the Church could not be handled in any such arbitrary fashion, and excuses and evasions were resorted to, to cover the interval during which Peter was preparing the way for his new plan. During the twenty years which elapsed before he finally announced the establishment of the Synod, Peter saw to it that most of the chief places in the Church were filled with clergy from Little Russia, where the Church schools were more clearly inclined toward West-European ideas. Then when he had a majority of the higher clergy whose "minds ran along with his own", and the Church had been twenty years without a Patriarch, whose office was fast becoming a historic memory, Peter proposed his new plan.

For two years the Bishop of Pskov, Theophanes Prokopovitch, a favorite and a creature of Peter's, had been at work on the "Duchovny Reglament", "Clerical Regulations", embodying a new arrangement of all the major institutions of Church organization. The chief matter presented was the institution of a Holy Synod, so called to make the innovation appear to resemble the ancient form of church government by a council. A year was spent in its consideration by clergy and government alike. Its provisions, of course, were colored by the reforms immediately needed, and this fact coupled with the unchanged form in which the Synod persisted through two hundred years, was one of the causes of its harmful effect upon Russian religious life.

After a year's consideration, the new organ of church government was finally opened (1721) under the name of "The Most Holy Governing Synod". Two years later a council of the Eastern Patriarchs sent a deed of recognition and confirmation of the institution. The letter recognizes the Synod as the "Brother

in Christ" of the other Patriarchs. It is confirmed in the same rights and authority as one of them. Naturally, the Eastern Patriarchs, themselves subjects of a Mohammedan Sultan, were in no very favorable position to resist diplomatic pressure urging such a formal recognition, and it is not known how willingly the letter was dispatched. On the other hand, it is quite clear that in this early period few or none, even of the Russian clergy, realized the completely altered status of the governing agent of the Church.

The new institution was to consist of a college of clergy, all ranks being represented and each member, including the President, having one vote. As long as he lived Yavorski occupied the President's chair, which was never filled after his death in 1722. In general the Synod was to conform to the organization and function of the Senate, whose great palace was built adjoining its own, in Petrograd, and like the Senate it had a "Prokuror", a layman appointed by and responsible only to the Tsar. As the instructions Peter gave the first man to occupy that position say, he is to be "the eye of the Tsar, and attorney for national affairs". While this was not evident at first, it later developed that the Procuror was really the guiding power of the Synod. Through his function of "stopping unlawful decisions and reporting them to the Tsar", he was able to exercise an absolute control. When it is remarked that all members of the Council, as well as the Procuror himself, were appointed by the Tsar, the complete subjection of Church government to the will of the Emperor is evident. In affairs of the Church its theoretical position was to be what the Senate was in civil matters. Really, both were in the hands of the autocracy.

It must never be supposed, however, that Peter or any other Tsar was "The head of the Church" as foreigners so often put it. The Eastern Church has never recognized any head but Christ; in a church

service, the Tsar kissed the hand of a parish priest as well as that of the Bishop, in token that he was "one of the flock, not one of the shepherds". Although all members of the Holy Synod took an oath of allegiance to the Tsar, still his control was civil, not ecclesiastical. In matters of dogma or purely church discipline he had no right to participate.

The authority of the Synod was, to quote the "Regulations", "The same as a Patriarch, if not greater, being a council". For two hundred years its general functions remained the same as when it first came into being, although varied changes occurred in its mode of organization and choice of personnel. The duties of the Holy Synod were four-fold; first, to make new laws regarding the Orthodox Church or its members. It had the right, always with Imperial approval, to enlarge its own powers or code of laws. The second function was to "care for the purity of faith and public worship". In this connection it was instructed to "root out all superstition, heresies or schisms", a clear reflection of the early years of the "Raskol". Under this duty of assuring the purity of worship, too, came the Synod's work of examining and deciding upon proposals for the canonization of saints, as well as the attestation of reported miracles, wonder-working ikons, and the like.

The third function of the Holy Synod dealt with education, although the positive side of that duty did not come immediately to the fore. It was to "examine and pass upon books upon all religious subjects," and down to the time of the 1917 Revolution, not even a new church anthem could be published without the censor's stamp of the Holy Synod. Later, when an educational system began to be urged the Synod assumed charge of all Church schools in the country and it was largely responsible for the low cultural level of all of them, including the parish secondary schools.

The fourth duty of the Synod was economic. It was to control the building of churches and monasteries and the material support of the Church. With this financial power in its hands, as well as the moral support of the Tsar, the Synod really came to represent more power than a Patriarch, and all that power was under the absolute control of the Autocracy.

This submission to government control was chiefly brought about by the authority which the "Reglament" granted to the Oberprokuror. Although Peter's original scheme for church government had provided for a council of twelve, consisting of both clerical and lay members, the custom soon established itself of having a considerably smaller body, with the Oberprokuror the only layman in its makeup. The eventual relationships between Oberprokuror and Synod tended to place the former in a position of practical dictatorship. The Synod's decrees were valid only if confirmed by the Tsar, but they could be presented to him only by the Oberprokuror. If he chose, he vetoed synodal decisions himself. If he did not go to this length, he had only to refrain from presenting a decree for the Tsar's approval, and it lapsed automatically. It was even forbidden for the Synod to have any communication with the Emperor save through the Oberprokuror. Only in the early years of the twentieth century, (1905) did the Tsar finally concede to the presiding Bishop of the Holy Synod the right of direct access to himself, and then only on the condition that the Oberprokuror be present at such interviews. The years 1905 and 1906, by the way, gave promise of numerous other reforms in church life, even extending to the imperial order for the assembling of a General Council; this, however, with characteristic Tsarist cunning refrained from setting any date, thereby completely annulling what it ostensibly proclaimed. But all these reforms, like those proposed at the same time for civil life, faded from

sight again, once the Autocracy recovered from the fright occasioned by the 1905 revolutionary movenent.

Another element contributing to make the Oberprokuror complete master of the Church was the fact that the appointment of members of the Synod was virtually in his hands. Formally, the Emperor named men to sit in the Synod's councils, but the appointments were made from lists presented by the Oberprokuror and, if the latter happened to be in favor with the Tsar, upon his recommendation. To be sure, four members of the Synod were appointed for life, the Metropolitans of Moskow, Petrograd and Kiev and the Exarch of Georgia, but these cathedra were also filled by Imperial appointment, usually in recognition of particular service to the government. Thus the Synod became a council under the complete control of the Oberprokuror who not only virtually chose its members, but confirmed or nullified its decisions at the dictates of his own desires or policy.

When it is remembered that the Synod alone had the right of appointment to all of the episcopal sees of Russia, and that in this, again, the Oberprokuror could direct its action, it will be still clearer what a complete control the government had on the Church. A bishop in one see did something which displeased the Oberprokuror, or which was considered inimical to the best interests of the government, and in immediate response he would be transferred to some diocese of less importance. In like manner a bishop's services to the Tsar's regime, or his loyalty to the current political policies was rewarded by his translation to a see of greater dignity. In the latter half of the nineteenth century this constant transfer of bishops became an important factor in retarding the development of the Orthodox Church. A bishop would not have time properly to become acquainted with the life and needs of a given diocese, until some political change with which he was possibly only vaguely concerned

would result in his being moved off to some other part of the Russian world, perhaps as remote as is Tiflis from Vladivostok.

The fact that only "hand-picked" men were given seats in the Synod, together with the custom, altered only in the last years of the old regime, of having only bishops, and hence only the "Black" clergy represented, naturally reacted upon the respect the Synod commanded among the Church at large. In the years just before the Revolution two members of the "White" clergy, Father Peter Smirnoff and the widely-known Father John of Kronstadt were appointed to the Synod. But the change came too late to alter materially the feeling, always particularly emphasized by the "Old Believers", that the Synod was a non-canonical organ. The "Old Believers", of course, always refused to recognize it; the Church at large distrusted it. This general dissatisfaction with the Synod as a form of church government was doubtless an element in the growing popular distrust of the Church as a whole, which marked the closing decades of the old regime.

The evils of such a system are at once apparent. Bound absolutely to the will of the Autocrat through the personality of the Oberprokuror, the Synod in its turn ruled the Church at large just as autocratically. There was no pretence at representation or any hint of democracy. The fact that the sole mediator between the Tsar and the Synod was the Oberprokuror whose will was law, so far as the Synod's decisions were concerned, placed the Church in a bondage almost as complete as the submission of the Church of Rome to the Pope. It is not strange that the title, "Russian Pope" was sometimes applied to the Oberprokuror. This subjugation to the Oberprokuror was the more irksome in that he was a layman and not a cleric. Even with the Oberprokuror Orthodox and a man of good intentions, neither of which was always the case, the system of having its Church so completely under the power of

a layman, responsible only to the Tsar, could not but work harm to the Christianity of Russia.

Many of the Oberprokurors of the two centuries the Synod endured were strange men to occupy such authoritative ecclesiastical position. Atheists, men of Protestant leanings, soldiers and attorneys have held the post. Sometimes the man in the Prokuror's chair was able to make himself, as in the case of that forceful personality Pobiedonostseff, the most powerful person in the government. The records these men left behind them were in many cases no brighter that of Pobiedonostseff himself. Hence it is not strange that popular respect for the Church did not flourish in those two centuries. Synods changed with the color of Imperial politics. The hottest partisanship intrigued its "Holy" attention, and the value of the Synod's activity, so far as truly spiritual things were concerned, was not at all comparable to that of a patriarch.

Under this sort of system, the Church often became the tool of the government for promoting its policies, other than ecclesiastical. While much good resulted from government support of missions, for instance, by the spreading of enlightenment through yet uncivilized regions, still the mission-work is one of the few exceptions to a vast generality of results decidedly hostile to the best interests of the Orthodox Church. Even this should be qualified, perhaps, by saying that where government-supported mission-work was carried on in lands with a lower civilization, even though with the secondary purpose of the inclusion of those territories in the Empire of the Tsars, the results for Russian Christianity were beneficial; but not always when that propaganda was carried on in lands of an equal or higher cultural level. It has been the public policy of the Church, for generations, not to undertake Orthodox missions in countries where this would involve competition with other Chrisian faiths, and as a rule the policy has been adhered to. Although there are Ortho-

dox churches in almost all of the great cities of Europe, they exist to serve the Orthodox who visit these places, rather than as centers for propagating the orthodox faith. This has not been true, however, of territories immediately contiguous to the western boundaries of Russia. In keeping with the ancient conception of Russian and Orthodox as more or less synonymous terms, the government of the Tsar made every effort to induce the population in newly-acquired territories on the West and South to accept Orthodoxy. The finest churches were built, priests who labored successfully in the Baltics or Poland were given extra salaries; in some instances grants of land were made to those renouncing other faiths for Orthodoxy. In such measures of constraint the Church was compelled to acquiesce. In many instances the whole result, for both Church and State was not seriously unsatisfactory. In others, even a formal acceptance of Orthodoxy sometimes served simply to conceal a deep-seated hatred of the Russian Government and the Church as its agent. With this in mind, it does not surprise a visitor to Warsaw today to see the willful neglect and cruel defacement of the magnificent Orthodox Cathedral which stands in the center of that city. One of the finest specimens of modern Byzantine architecture, its beauty is lost upon the Poles to whom it is an unpleasant reminder of times when both their national and their religious life were under the power of Orthodox Russia. This State use of the Church for the furtherance of its own ends did not always cease at the borderlines of Russia. There was a suspicious ecclesiastical activity among the populations of Austrian Poland, upon which the Austrian Government kept ever a watchful eye, and every effort was made to cultivate the growth of Orthodoxy there. The fact is significant that although Galicia never belonged to Russia, the third Metropolitan in the Empire bore the title "Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia". Perhaps

the Tsar had visions of the day when the appellation should correspond with fact.

The Church was compelled to support the State in its efforts to control its people, within Russia itself. Even the institution of serfdom was occasionally approved by some churchman or other, although the Synod piously gave its public approval of the Emancipation, in 1862. This proclamation, be it said in defense of the Church, is believed to have been written by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moskow, one of the most prominent figures in the Orthodox Church during the two centuries of Synodal control. The bondage of Church to State was newly apparent, however, during the peasant uprisings which followed the execution of the Emancipation Proclamation. Although the serfs were freed, most of the land-owners, naturally, strove to give up to them as little land as possible, and the resulting dissatisfaction broke out in disorders which often had to be suppressed by the use of arms. The Synod stood publicly on the side of the Tsar : it appealed to local bishops to pacify their people. This was reactionary enough, but the climax came with an official order from the Synod, clearly under Government pressure, forbidding local priests to conduct funeral services for such peasants as had been killed in the disturbances. Against this order some of the Church's leaders found courage to protest, notable among them the professors and students of the Kazan Academy. Here one young theolog went so far as openly to conduct such a funeral, and was rewarded by exile to Yakutsk, in far northeast Siberia. All of the Church's educational reforms instituted by Pobiedonostseff, beneficent as they seemed, were inspired by the same desire to support and strengthen the Tsar's control upon his people. The Church found itself in every instance merely a tool in the hands of the Russian Autocracy.

This bending of the Church to meet political policy or emergency is illustrated again in the custom, increas-

ing toward the close of the period, of the frequent transfer of bishops from one see to another. As has been noted, the appointment of Bishops was the technical prerogative of the Synod, but actually often purely a matter of the will of the Oberprokuror. Hence the allocation of men to episcopal sees was made to serve other than purely ecclesiastical purposes. If a certain district showed evidences of becoming too liberal, the Synod was likely to place over it a bishop noted for his strong conservatism. Such a man who served the Government well was likely to be awarded, later, another bishopric of greater importance. Thus the liberals claim that Bishop Makarii of Tomsk was removed to become Metropolitan of Moskow, in token of appreciation for his services in crushing the 1905 revolution in his diocese. The system by which the bishop became thus dependent upon political conditions could not but work harm to the Church as a whole.

Perhaps a single, very typical, illustration will indicate how such a system worked. Bishop Agafangel of Riga, although well-known for his liberal views, which had resulted in his calling a church council in Riga during the Revolution of 1905, still was so successful in maintaining good-will and discipline among the hostile national elements of his diocese that he stood high in the estimation of the Government. This prestige was doubtless somewhat lessened by Agafangel's refusal to participate in, or give his blessing to, the newly-organized Riga branch of the "Society of the Russian People", a notoriously narrow and reactionary institution; but it was regained when the Bishop on account of his general popularity and fine presence was chosen to represent the city of Riga upon the occasion of the Tsar's visit in 1910. He accompanied the Emperor upon all public occasions and evidently made a very favorable impression upon the monarch. In token of this royal esteem, apparently, Bishop Agaf-

angel was removed to the episcopate of Vilna, a change regarded by everyone as a promotion.

In Vilna, however, the Society of the Russian People was not only strongly organized, but well supported by the Government's secret agents. Agafangel, in consistence with his attitude toward the same organization in Riga, refused it his support in Vilna. This was not what the Tsar's government expected of a Bishop of Vilna, however, and the matter came to a climax with Agafangel's refusal to participate in a procession organized by the "Society". Shortly afterward Agafangel was "demoted" to be Bishop of Yaroslavl, where he today occupies the bishop's seat.

But there is more to the story, which throws more light on the system by which, under the Synod, the Church was completely at the mercy of the State. In an apparent attempt to soften the punishment of his removal from Vilna, Agafangel was appointed a member of the Holy Synod. He took his seat not long before the Synod began to investigate the conduct of Barnabas, the peasant for whom Rasputin's influence had secured the appointment to the Cathedral of Tobolsk. The evidence secured clearly warranted the Synod in its decision, taken in direct opposition to the ruling party at Court, to remove Barnabas. Here again politics stepped in. The Oberprokuror, Sabler, refused to confirm the Synod's decree, and, in clear retaliation for such presumption he dropped Agafangel from the Synod altogether, and removed Vladimir, President of the Synod, from the Metropolitanate of Moskow to that of Kiev.

Perhaps these paragraphs will have made evident the evils which the Synodal system of government brought upon the Church. The whole organization was a machine for making the complete control of the Church a prerogative of the Tsar. If Luther could write of the pre-Reformation period in the Western Church as the Babylonian Captivity, the Synodal

period of Russian Church history may well be termed "The Church in Bonds". Its life is so dependent upon that of the civil government that a complete history of the Church of this period would involve a complete recital of political events, with the same amount of intrigue and scandal as that which characterized the diplomacy of those times. Hence but a few outstanding facts will be here pointed out as characteristic of the period as a whole.

One change in Church affairs in this period was the final secularization of monastery estates and the substitution of State support for the clergy, "black" and "white". The Church at large acquiesced in the confiscation of its estates, or at least there was small open protest. One notable figure stands out in contrast to the rest of the clergy in Arsenius Matsievitch, Bishop of Rostov (d. 1772) whose fearless protests against the encroachment of State upon Church authority caused his reduction and imprisonment. Others, through the years, have found courage to speak out against the control of the Synod, among them Father Gregory Petroff, of comparatively recent times.

Among the most important of the Church reforms introduced under the Synod was the increased attention given to clerical education. Up to this time parochial clergy had received their training on a sort of apprentice system whose results were unsatisfactory to say the least. Now the Synod took up the matter of schools, and the creation of Academies at Moskow and Petrograd was followed by instituting episcopal schools for the lower clergy. These eventually developed into the "Seminaries" in connection with every episcopal see. However wide their extension, these schools have never stood for a very high grade of culture. It was not in the interest of an autocratic government to have its people or its clergy too highly educated. The lower grades of teaching, parish schools, received fluctuating attention during this period, also. At times it

was the order to have a school in connection with each church. At other times government support, both moral and material, was withdrawn to such an extent as almost to wash out the entire system.

Another interesting story of the Synodal period is that of the production of the Bible in Russian. Up to 1712 the Scripture text in official use in Russia was the incorrect translation into Slavonic made in 1663, "now become such a bibliographic rarity that it was difficult to find it, even in churches". Under Peter, however, orders were given for a revised translation, the publication of which was authorized by the Synod in 1723. Between that year and 1751 there is a long story of typically Russian delays and new beginnings, with the entire printing establishment moved from Moskow to Petrograd and back again. In the latter year, however, the first edition was put into circulation and sold out in so brief a time that three others were necessary within the decade. Thenceforth the Bible was generally available in a correct and authorized Slavonic version.

In 1813 there began the meteoric career of the Russian Bible Society. Upon the initiative of two Englishmen who came into Russia for the purpose, a society was organized for the publication and distribution of the Bible "in all the languages of those foreigners living in Russia". The Emperor Alexander I gave his patronage, and all of the Russian society of that day hastened to follow his example. Money flowed into the treasury of the society in rivers. Within about a decade, the Bible had been issued in forty languages and dialects and the Emperor ordered the production of a Russian version. The Society had completed the preparation of this vernacular version of all of the New Testament and part of the Old, when it came under suspicion of political activities and was closed by Imperial order, in 1826.

How large a part was played in the closure of the Society by this proposed edition of the Bible in the language of the people, no one can say. At all events the Synod vigorously opposed either official or private attempts to produce the Scriptures in the "natural Russian". Two innovators who made attempts to issue such versions were punished by imprisonment. Again in 1856 the plan was urged by its former advocate Philaret, Metropolitan of Moskow, and at last the Synod authorized the production of a Russian Bible. Twenty years were occupied in the task, with the best scholarship in Russia engaged upon it, and in 1877 the first complete and authorized edition of the Bible appeared in the language of the people. Since that time no official obstruction has been offered to the distribution of the Bible with the utmost freedom, the only condition made having been that for Orthodox people it should be prepared in the version authorized by the Synod. In 1918, after the Synod printing press had been "nationalized", it was the privilege of several non-Orthodox societies from abroad to help supply the Church with copies of its own version of the Scriptures for distribution among its people, the texts used being reprints of the Synod's edition, published in England, Switzerland and America.

In a recent discussion of the effect upon the Russian Church of the oppression of the Synod period, a Russian Archpriest maintained that in certain phases at least, the Church actually profited by the Synod's control. He mentioned especially the progress of missions in the last two hundred years. During those two centuries Orthodox missions by the aid of State grants of money, literally penetrated to every corner of the Russian Empire and overflowed into many foreign lands. As early as 1705 a mission was founded in far Kamchatka which made such progress in the spread of the Gospel that in 1751, upon the report of the Archimandrite in charge that there was "no one left

to convert", the mission was changed into a sort of sub-diocese. Mission work has been carried on in China since 1715, with small success, however, compared to that in Japan, which began a century and a half later. China has not more than a half dozen Orthodox Churches; in Japan there are more than forty. The first Orthodox Missionaries in North America entered by way of the Aleutian Islands in 1793, and in 1828 a large and successful work was inaugurated in the Altai Mountain section of Central Asia. Most of this mission effort, of course, would have been impossible without the aid of State subsidies, and most of that conducted outside the boundaries of the Empire has been especially aided in this way. The flourishing Semipalatinsk Mission in Central Siberia, on the other hand, has always received its chief support from private sources.

A contemporary author in his division of Russian Church history, speaks of the Synodal period as the Decline of the Church. In a large measure his epithet is justified. With the Church under the absolute control of a bureaucratic system and an autocratic Tsar, the inevitable result was a tendency to subordinate the spiritual welfare of the people at large, to the immediate interests of political circumstances. It was a long time after the initiation of the Synod, before the Church as a whole learned to accommodate itself to the new arrangement, and there are many of its defenders who claim that it never fully abandoned itself to the sheltered captivity in which the Imperial government placed it. Nevertheless, when the whole financial support as well as the executive control of its affairs rested in the hands of the government, a tendency was noticeable toward a general acquiescence in the status quo, and a relaxation of attempts at progress. Beside this, the system under which the clergy lived, as outlined in Chapter VIII of the present monograph, was another element in what is undeniably a decline in leadership

and popular favor and confidence through the two hundred years since 1721. At times, the government did not scruple to use church officials as part of the hated secret police system. Church reports were used for purposes of civil control, and other similar abuses, really attributable far more to the charge of the government than to that of the Church, caused a growing popular distrust of the Church's sincerity and usefulness.

Much has been said in recent years about the evils and shortcomings of the Orthodox Church. It has been accused of acting as an agent of political intrigue; its low standards of education, both for its priests and for their flocks, and even the fact that it failed to engage in modern social work as churches in America know the term — all these have been brought forward as evidence of the collapse of the Russian Church into an innoccuous desuetude. All such criticisms, even were it demonstrable that they represented facts, are based upon a historic perspective so short as to give a very faulty view. The student of history in general will not fail to observe that these much emphasized faults are all the product of the Synodal period alone, only one-fifth of the entire time the Church has been in existence. For eight centuries it was the foremost agency of popular enlightenment and national progress. The greatest men and the most valuable institutions for all this time were the products of the Church. Patriotism and religion, culture and enlightenment; in all of these the Church led the Russian people and helped to form its character.

Then the Autocracy shut down on the Church as it had, before, on the people, and progress stopped and virility declined. There are those who say the Orthodox Church is hopeless — paralyzed by two hundred years of bondage. Perhaps this is true. The way to decide the question is to watch what happens in Russian Christianity during its first decade of freedom. If history and past achievement offer any criteri-

on, the Church should step out from its long retirement like Philip from his monastery to stand at the head of a people struggling in the uncertainty of a new-found and unanticipated freedom, leading and spiritualizing and setting new standards for a developing national life. With eight hundred years of such proud history to which to point, before the bondage of the Synodal period began, it is perhaps unjust to center attention solely upon the past two centuries with their small progress and meagre standards, deciding that the Church has forever lost its power of leadership. Unjust, unless one takes into account what happened as soon as the fetters were shaken off, together with such indications of future possibilities as are available from the present status of church affairs. In the hope that it will offer material giving light on this factor most essential for an adequate assessment of the future possibilities of the Orthodox Church, the last chapter of this book has been prepared in Moskow, with the latest evidences obtainable.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE.

One of the innovations which the Revolution brought, in Russia, was the appellation "Tovarisch", "Comrade", by which everyone addressed everyone else, just as the French revolutionists called everyone "Citizen". And a Russian acquainted with the life of peasant communities remarked that it had penetrated even to village gatherings and displaced the time-honored mode of address: "Ye Orthodox". In former times when a peasant stood up to speak to his fellow Russians he called them his Orthodox Brothers, as naturally as an American candidate for office says broadly "My Fellow Citizens". And the fact is not without significance; the prime characteristic of the Russian Church is its nationality. Probably nowhere else in history has a Church so completely identified itself with a nation's life. Excepting possibly the Georgian Church, whose historic life if actually unbroken is so very tenuous as to be of small consequence, no other national church has such an unbroken history of a thousand years. And every year of that long history is so intimately bound up with the story of the growth and development of the Russian nation as is the history of no other national church. Christianity brought the introduction of Western civilization into Russia. The Church was the pioneer force which Russianized vast heathen territories at the same time as it Christianized them, and thus prepared them for inclusion in the Russian domain. When the Tatar oppression shut down on Russia it was the Church which maintained its own integrity through two hundred years of slavery,

and, preserving and unifying Russian spirit, gave the motive force for throwing off the hated yoke. When no other power could bring into a united front the warring native princes, the Church proclaimed the cause of the true faith against the infidels, and the Battle of the Don broke the tradition of two centuries of bondage.

And what was true of a fourteenth-century war has been true of most of the wars of Russia ever since. Sagacious rulers of the Russian land have always recognized that the surest way to gain the support of the people in a given military enterprise was to picture it as a battle for the true Faith. So Ivan led his troops against the Lithuanians. That was the battle-cry of Minin, the Butcher of Novgorod, and it resulted in the expulsion of Polish armies which had overrun all of Central Russia. There has never been a war against the Turks which was not represented, and believed in by the people, as a righteous crusade against Mohammedan scoffers at the Christian religion. The idea persists outside of Russia, and Bulgarian peasants tell how the Tsar's armies rescued their Orthodox brother Slavs from Turkish bondage. And surely no other factor in the last War more deeply stirred the hearts of the tremendous armies of Russia than the belief, grown into a certainty after the agreement of 1916, that now after eight hundred years of infidel occupation they should wrest Constantinople again from the Turk and replace the Crescent with the true Cross over the soaring domes of St. Sophia.

The reconquest of Constantinople or any other non-Christian territory would have been in exact accord with the tradition already mentioned that Russia was the special defender of the true and orthodox faith, with Moskow as the third Rome. This idea is very much more than a theory; it has been definitely proclaimed for a dozen generations and down to the chaos of post-revolutionary days it was an actual part

of the mental makeup of many Russians. Rome had had the true faith and had apostasized over the Filioque: Constantinople became Rome's successor but when she impiously sought alliance with the Catholic West in the fifteenth century her sin was punished by the incursion of Islam, and Moskow, alone in her steadfastness in the true faith, came into the inheritance. So that when a peasant, whose name itself is closely related to the word "Christian", stood up in an assembly and addressed his fellows as "Ye Orthodox" he was giving voice to a conviction grown out of eight centuries of Russian history, that his church and his nation were indissolubly bound together. Through a half dozen changes in formal governments, ranging all the way from the Church's practical control of State affairs to its almost complete subjugation by the State, the Russian Church and the Russian people have developed side by side and "Orthodox" has become almost a synonym for Russian. If ever a church was truly national, in the broadest implication of the term, it is the Orthodox Church of Russia.

With the Church so bound up in the life of the nation, it is natural to suppose that the life of the people, as well, should reflect this relationship. And it is difficult to think of a personal or popular circumstance in which this reflection cannot be traced. In such primitive and fundamental matters as the naming of the days of the week, Christianity has had its influence. Our West calls its Sabbath by a pagan appellation: Sunday, to a Russian is "Voskresenia", the Day of Resurrection. Monday is the "Day after the Holiday", a still more primitive reminder of Christian influence.

The Russian has all sorts of poetic names for his church. It is often referred to as the Garden of God: a garden satisfies all the senses — all the material needs of man. Beside providing him with sustenance, its perfumes and its colors appeal to the non-material side of his nature. So the church, with its light and

color, its restfulness and spiritual food for the believer, comes to be known in Slavonic lands as God's Garden. The historic role of the Church in Russia as a cultural agency is indicated in such appellations as the "Torch", or the "Lighthouse of Russia". The Church's leaders delight in such names and enlarge upon its value as a light-bringer, driving away shadows of ignorance, revealing true and false in their proper colors, discriminating between good and evil. "The Sun of Russia" is another common pseudonym for the Church which reveals the general feeling that for most of all that it has of enlightenment, of the warmth of civilization, Russia has to thank its Church.

Their earliest acquaintance with Christianity brought Russian folk into contact with Western civilization and to this day popular life retains the impress. The "Domostroi" of Sylvester, a household guide for generations in the middle ages, is an illustration of this. The peasant learned, then, to divide his agricultural year into parts which he named from the church calendar. In present-day Russia the peasant reckons his harvesting from "The Day of Peter and Paul" or regulates the planting of his fields according to the "Day of the Holy Spirit". Every Russian celebrates as his personal anniversary not the day of his birth but the holiday of the Saint for whom he was named. This is a survival and a curious inversion of the earlier practice, universal throughout Russia, of naming an infant for the saint on whose holiday it was born. Now it is still the general custom to name a child after some saint, though not neceassrily the one whose holiday coincides with the birthday, and "the day of one's angel" is still the holiday a Russian observes, instead of the anniversary of his birth. I remember the anxiety with which a young Russian mother sent to inquire of a priest if there was a saint in the church calendar named Florence, for she had heard the name in England, and had her heart set

upon giving it to her new-born daughter. A search of the complete calendar discovered a Saint Florentia, and the date of commemoration of that holy person was carefully noted as the day for all future anniversaries of the little girl, instead of her real birthday.

But it is not at birthdays alone that the life of Russian folk connects itself with the Church. Every event from cradle to coffin is marked by church festival. Baptism brings to the Orthodox child the tiny cross which he wears around his neck to his grave. Was there a bridal? Until the revolution the Russian was compelled by law to have the wedding performed in the church. A funeral would not be a funeral without the offices of the priest. At the time of the second Revolution in a great city like Odessa it was not the sight of more than a hundred coffins carried through the streets which evoked shocked protest even from intellectuals, so much as did the interment of all victims of the fighting, without any religious ceremony. When a man went on a journey, or a son left home for the University, a special household Te Deum was said. In illness the priest was called upon to come to the bedside, often to bring some specially revered ikon, and it was no uncommon sight on the streets of Moskow to see the coach and four with lighted lamps and accompanying clergy, in which the Iverian Madonna went out to the bedside of some wealthy invalid. In the spring a special service was held asking God's blessing on the sowing of the fields: the harvest festival saw a solemn rite of thanksgiving: the opening of a new place of business, or entrance into new living apartments called each for its own special religious celebration. Birth and death; seed-time and harvest; every phase of popular life was subtly connected with the presence and participation of the church and its representatives.

Another element in peasant life which discloses this influence of the Church interwoven through all his thoughts appears in the thousands of proverbs

which form the currency of folk-speech. "Without a Cross there were no Christ," sums up the deeply-rooted Russian reverence for suffering. "The Church is not built of logs, but of (human) ribs" is the way the peasant says "the Kingdom of God is within you". Scores of other sayings are equally characteristic and while many of them are of this high spiritual character it must be confessed that at least as large a number have a lamentably lower moral value. "He has a priest's eye" means he covets what he sees. "Man for himself, but God for all" is a decided concession to the innate selfishness which has troubled not only Russians but other men of every century. And when the peasant reminds himself that "even the bishop steals if he is hungry", he is stating a moral precept which the theory of the Church was never responsible for, however errant may have been its practice. But whatever the morals expressed in these proverbs, it is evident that the institution of the Church, its material mechanism, if you will, which has accompanied every step of Russian progress or retrogression through a thousand years of history, has deeply registered itself upon the people's forms of speech, if not so clearly upon their moral consciousness.

From the content of many of these popular expressions it will be evident that in the united evolution of Church and people, it is not always the Church which has been the active agent in their reciprocal accommodation. In addition to moulding popular thought, the Church has to a certain extent been moulded by it. The statement has been advanced by critics of the Russian Church that it has never developed a popular code of ethics. In a measure this is true. It reveals the influence of the Eastern mind upon the development of the Church's thought. The East has never been vitally concerned with codes, with the reduction of any activity to a carefully fixed set of laws. The Nicene Creed has contented them through all the

centuries. Eastern monasticism has lived for a thousand years by the Rule of St. Basil, whose program the West within a few generations found not sufficiently exact and which has resulted in a score of separate monastic orders in the succeeding centuries. Miliukov claims the natural Russian characteristics are primitively Christian and that the people have never developed away from these simple and early moral ideals. It is doubtless very difficult in analyzing Russian religious life, to decide where primitive character ends and Christianity begins; but if the Church in Russia has not been as influential along lines of public morals as we of the West might wish, it is partly the result of its environment — its too complete identification with the life of the Russian people.

But that is not to assert that this Church is incapable of developing an ethic in the future. The first requisite for such a development must be the realization of the need, and this very deficiency has been no inconsiderable factor in the Church discussions ever since the Revolution. One day in 1917 I was reading to a Russian bishop a letter in which a young American friend whose father's death had recently made him a very rich man, wrote of his intention to devote his life and property to the welfare of the town where his father's wealth had been accumulated. Tears stood in the Bishop's eyes as he said: "We have too little of that kind of Christianity in Russia. And to develop it must be the first task of the Church".

A traveller in Russia today will be struck with the material evidences of the Church which he finds at every turn. Before the Revolution one of the first things which would have been forced upon his attention was the vast number of Church holidays, "wherein no man can work". A shopping expedition was likely to be in vain because one had forgotten it was St. Nicholas' Day or the Day of the Holy Trinity and all stores would be closed. One went to the bath or the bank,

and shuttered windows reminded his irreligious western mind it was a feast day of the Church. School children regretted the abdication of the Tsar, for they reckoned that it meant six less holidays in the year: the birthdays and name-days of the Tsar, Tsaritsa and Tsarevitch. Holidays were actually so numerous as to have been a real factor in the retarded development of Russia. People who have an average of five working days in a week cannot expect to keep pace with that part of the world which has only one instead of two weekly holidays. And even if a new regime shall have abolished most of these holidays it will be long generations before the church calendar disappears as the common-people's mode of date-reference. "Two weeks before the Assumption," "the day after the Great Blessing of Waters", and similar phrases will long be heard on the lips of common folk in Russia. They have been in currency for a score of generations, and even a revolutionary government cannot remove them overnight.

Again, the traveller in Russia of today will be impressed by the surprising number of churches or monasteries which cover all the country, town and city alike. It would be difficult to find a landscape in any inhabited part of Russia without an "eight-pointed cross", as the people call the Byzantine symbol which crowns every golden dome and every wayside shrine. It may be that the drab and colorless village is too small to boast of a church; even so, you are sure to see a holy picture of some sort, under a canopy or set in the top of a mossy brick pillar. Everywhere you look, your eye is taken by the evidence that, in form at least, Russia is not only Christian, but Orthodox.

And here is another item wherein the religion of Russian common-folk differs from that of ours in the West. Watch the peasant as he passes a church or a tiny shrine at a village cross roads and notice how he does reverence every time he sees the Holy Cross.

He bows and devoutly crosses himself, three fingers touching successively brow, and chest, and shoulders from right to left. The sight of the church has reminded him of God; how many of us pass places of prayer with not even a momentary thought of worship or devotion! To be sure, the critical West may remark, and with reason, on the decidedly primitive idea of God of which the peasant is reminded, but is it any the less real devotion? Whatever the stage of philosophic advancement of the religion it connotes, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the Orthodox Church is an institution so truly Russian that it is implicit in every phase of the life of Russian folk. Peasantry bear the name of Christian; every step of the historic development of Russia from a barbaric tribal government to the present century has been accompanied and influenced by the Church. For the Church and the Orthodox faith, accepted even if not fully comprehended, Russian soldiers have laid down their lives in a score of their country's wars; by the feasts and fastdays of the Church every circumstance of existence of the Russian folk is reckoned and correlated. The Russian landscape may be rich in gilded domes with the true Cross set above them: they might all vanish into air and the Church would still remain, for it is enshrined in Russian hearts.

And while the Church in popular thought is something more than its buildings and its ministers, still the latter are a very important factor in the life of the people. The Russian thinks of them as divided into two groups: the "Black Clergy", or the monastic orders, from which by inflexible custom the bishops are chosen, and the "White Clergy", by which he understands the ordinary parish priests. These latter are of course in the majority and it is with them the popular life has always come most closely into contact.

The "Popes" as the village folk call their priests, are usually married. One might as well leave out that

qualifying adverb: it is a rare exception to find a village priest who is not the head of his own household. For while there is no absolute rule that a parish priest must be married, and there are instances on record like that in the middle of the last century where Philaret, Metropolitan of Moskow, ordained a celibate to the priesthood, still no similar case occurred again in the whole century, and that is a fair commentary on the rigidity of the custom. This fact is due to two causes: first, the ancient canon of the Church which forbids the marrying of ordained persons, but permits married men to be ordained, and second, the mode of life and support which characterizes the parish clergy.

Under the old regime the average parish priest was supported, not like his monastic colleague by State subsidies or the income from monastery property, but by the results of his own or his parish's toil upon the usually all too small plot of ground assigned to the church in the communal division of the land. Just as any other peasant took it for granted that he should have a wife and family to help him in making a living, so the village priest felt marriage to be a necessity. With all the help of his children, though, his land yielded no large support. Besides this meager income, eked out with a small part of the collections in his church, he had the fees he could gather for various services he was called upon to perform in his priestly office. These fees came to be the chief reliance of parish priests as a means of support, and the system, of course, led to much unpleasantness. A priest was almost compelled to demand for a given service the utmost he could obtain from a given client. So it often came about that a wedding or a christening or even a burial was preceded by a long haggling argument as to how much the priest should receive for his services. To a certain degree the peasant was at the mercy of his pastor, for the law compelled him to ask for the services of a priest of his own parish. And there was often great dis-

satisfaction with the fees the "pope" demanded. This explains why after the Revolution, when the people in a certain Siberian parish began their first attempts at local legislation, the first ordinance passed was to prevent a priest from charging more than three roubles for a marriage ceremony.

Aside from his fees the priest had the usufruct of half the land allotted to his parish church, often a pitifully inadequate amount. This was tilled, theoretically, by the voluntarily contributed labor of the peasantry, but this form of aid was no exception to the usual rule with volunteer service and often resulted in the priest's doing the major portion of his own work himself. And it was no uncommon sight to see the "pope" with his brown or black robe as dusty as his heavy boots, trudging along behind his plough, or stooping over the sickled sheaves in his harvest field. With his own living and that of his usually numerous family thus dependent upon his labor, it is not difficult to reckon the amount of time the priest would have for meditation or study. His ministration was too often reduced by the very rigor of this struggle for existence to the formal production of the service on Saturday evenings and Sundays in the church, and the performance of such special rites as were asked by his parishioners.

With a picture in mind of these conditions and the often miserably poor material support available for the white clergy, it is easier both to understand and to condone the correspondingly lower standards of life which characterized them as a class. To be sure, these conditions brought the priest closer to the lives of his people, but perhaps, too close. It was most difficult in the stress of getting enough to live on out of the slender means at his disposal, not to fall into ways of spiritual sloth, to say nothing of material greed and calculating bargains. And when the peasant knew so intimately the struggle and subterfuges to

which his priest was reduced in gathering a living for himself and his family, it was not strange if he failed to find much moral inspiration in his "little father". He did not expect to find it: if the pope served at the altar, fulfilled the letter of his other churchly functions at the proper times and seasons, and did not ask too much for special services, the peasant was content.

In recent years much improvement has been made in the condition of the white clergy and their educational standards have been measurably heightened. Still many of the old difficulties have prevailed. With the horizon limited to his parish, and small chance to rise to a higher position there was no incentive to the priest to undertake long years of preparation for his ministry or to put forth very strenuous effort for self-improvement after his ordination. In spite of this, great characters are not wanting among the families of the white clergy. The "pope", if he wished, by dint of study and successful work in his early ministry might attain the rank of "protoierey", arch-priest, and many of the most influential men of the last two centuries have been representatives of this ranking class of married clergy. Most of the seminary faculties and many of the consistory offices were supplied by this class of arch-priests. They could even attain a seat in the Holy Synod. It is an interesting thing that when the present Patriarch was elected, one of his first official acts was to send to America for one of these arch-priests, and Father Hotovitsky, a man of most unusual abilities combined with equally exceptional spirituality went from the Russian Cathedral in New York to be the chief adviser of the head of all the Russian Orthodox Church.

But our picture of the Russian parish priest would be incomplete if it stopped at a delineation of his faults. Uncultured he may be; driven by the system under which he lived into mediocre moral attitudes toward the execution of his office; so identified with

the life of his flock as often to be of small spiritual value or inspiration to them. But this very intimacy qualified him at the same time for knowing how best to deal with his people, for a true appreciation of their needs. And in beautiful contradiction to his low estate and equally humble cultural level, the parish priest often gave himself to the utmost for the welfare of his flock. Not once but scores of times, have members of the white clergy perished in the snow in a futile attempt to take the last offices of the Church to sick or dying in some far corner of their oftentimes huge parishes. The stories of the Tsar's armies are full of instances where the spiritual life of whole regiments has been infused with higher ideals through the influence of some army chaplain. Take this insight into popular character, coupled with the genuine childish simplicity of the devotion one finds in the "little fathers" of the common folk of Russia, inspire them with better learning and some of the best ideals of Western Christianity which can be brought them by men like Father Hotovitsky, and new life and higher morale will flow from them throughout all the Russian land.

In a contrast with the White Clergy so marked that it has often resulted in actual jealousy, are the other half of the Russian clerical world, the "Black" or monastic priests. As their monastic vocation indicates, they are distinct from the parish priests as differences in every phase of existence can make them. Celibacy and monastic life, higher standards of culture resultant from a greater ease in living: all these indicate the sharp distinction between the two orders. Some further commentary may be needed to explain the disharmony between them. The white clergy are in the numerical majority, but the black clergy have always retained control of church affairs. The prime reason for this lies in the fact that the hierarchy of the Church is chosen by almost inviolable custom from the monastic orders. Thus Bishops and Metropolitans

as well as Deans of important educational and governmental institutions were always men with the black veil of the monastic vow. The monk, freed from the care of supporting a family, with greater leisure to devote to study, and a higher average culture than his parish colleague, found ways to advancement open more often to him than to the "little fathers" in the villages. Monasteries were usually amply supported and the higher ranks of their inhabitants lived a much easier life than was possible to the average parish priest. In view of all these material advantages, combined with and partly resulting from a complete monopoly of control in ecclesiastical affairs, it is not difficult to see why friction between the two orders existed even though the common interests of church unity prevented its often coming into open expression. Some closer attention to the lives of the black clergy will make the situation more apparent.

Monasticism in Russia is as old as Russian Christianity. The earliest church chronicles have a tradition of monastic visitors and even small monasteries in South Russia before the time of Vladimir. The great cave-colony of the Pecherskaya Lavra at Kiev epitomizes all the pre-Muscovite history of Russia just as does the Sergievsky Cloister, all of that connected with Moskow. These monasteries, like dozens of others, have not merely witnessed the flow of Russian history; they have directed it.

When Charlemagne wished to prepare the wild tribes in what is now Northern Germany for his more civilized kingship, he caused to go out to those territories missionary monks, the cultural influence of whose colonies most effectively prepared the way for the introduction of civil law and a peaceful government. In Russia, from the Black Sea to the Arctic and six thousand miles across Siberia the monasteries, planted not at the behest of a Prince, but pressing out into untried wildernesses for the Gospel's sake alone, have served

the same historical purpose on a vastly grander scale. From the times when the monks ventured out from Kiev into the far North and founded a cloister on Lake Ladoga in the time of Yaroslav the Wise, almost every century down to the nineteenth has seen some hitherto barbaric section of the Russian land opened to culture and enlightenment by these same monastic pioneers of Christian civilization. Stephen of Perm, the holy Zosimus in the Solovetsky Monastery, the founders of the Innokentievsky Cloister in far Irkutsk: these are examples of the pioneering work the monks have done for Russia. About a monastery in the wilderness there sprang up centers of population and civilized life from which radiated beams of culture to enlighten whole territories. Thus great reaches were first conquered for the Church and later for the Tsar, by the lay servants of his Empire.

Nor must we forget the contribution to Russian history made by these monasteries in the great lives they have produced. From the gates of the cloister which he had founded, St. Sergius sent forth Dmitri Donskoi to free the land from the Tatars. And from those early days down almost to our own time, the Troitskaya Sergievskaya Lavra has played a vital role in guiding Russia through times of crisis. It was the preaching of its monks which aroused the new spirit of patriotism that freed Russia from the Polish invaders in the time of Minin and Pojarski. It was the Solovetsky Monastery which produced the heroic Philip, whose insistence upon justice and right is one of the few beacon lights of higher ideals in the troubled darkness under Ivan the Terrible. Nikon, the reformer of the Russian Liturgy, was another product of the monastery and it is in his own cloister of the New Jerusalem where he lies buried. The beautiful life of the man now known as St. Seraphim was lived in a monastery which grew famous for his holy character, and he died there less than a century ago. For the

shrine where high idealism and love of country and the right have been preserved in their noblest form, go to the monasteries, pioneers and leaders in education and patriotism down through all the nine centuries of Russian history.

These establishments have been the great sources of religious zeal and missionary effort as well. The very spread of the net-work of cloisters which touches all the corners of Russia and is encountered again in parts of the globe as remote as Palestine or North America, is a clear manifestation of this fact. Although he lives in New York, the Russian Archbishop bears the title "Bishop of the Aleutian Islands and North America" because it was by way of missions across Behring Strait and monasteries founded on the shores of Alaska, that Orthodoxy made its first entrance into the Western World.

In a consideration of the place and influence of the Russian monasteries of today, some attention should be given first to their characteristics of life and organization. For this purpose, perhaps it will be sufficient to point out those features wherein cloister life in Russia differs from the more familiar monasticism of the West. Just as the faith of Russia is an inheritance of the earliest times and her forms of worship are among the best examples we know today of the rites of the earliest Christian centuries, so the cloister life retains the main features of early Christian monasticism. The emphasis in Russia is still more definitely upon the ideal of holiness, of retirement from the world, than upon social service, hence it has not produced any militant order like the Jesuits in the Western Church. Equally consonant with the Eastern atmosphere of the rest of Russia's religious life is the monastic emphasis upon the value of contemplation and prayer. Often men who have been drawn out from their monasteries to duties in contact with the world, have longed, like Maxim the Greek, to return to the

lives they felt more worth while in the round of prayer and fasting in their cloisters. Thus a certain Siberian bishop whose first diocesan council after the Revolution had been broken up by a group of malcontents supported by soldiers, was led to remark that he longed to return to the quiet of his monastery where "it sometimes seems as though I could do more for my people in prayer, than in the retention of this office". Against his own desire, however, he has stayed on through the whole stormy five years since, and probably no church leader in any land is better loved or has a finer influence with all his people than this bishop today.

The embodiment of this ideal of holiness and retirement which forms the basis for all Russian monastic life is the Rule of St. Basil (d. A. D. 379) earliest of all such programs. Less definite than the Benedictine Rule of the West which is an outgrowth of it, the Rule of St. Basil emphasizes more the spirit than the letter of the law of holy living: it leaves to the discretion of the abbot more of the details of order and decorum than the more legalistic rules of the West. This results in a less advanced stage of organization. It is doubtless also the reason why in all the Eastern Church there is but one monastic order, the greater flexibility of Basil's Rule having accommodated the differences of specific ideal which in the West produced a score of distinct brotherhoods. This feature has prevented the rise in Russian monasticism of anything like the powerful machinery which offered such aid to developing civilization of the West and at the same time has often occasioned such severe disturbances. Single monasteries have been powerful factors in Russian life, but history, there, has never known such nations within a nation as is the circumstance presented by some of the mediaeval monastic orders of the West.

And of course such a monastic ideal has resulted in less rigidity of general discipline than have some of

those of the Occident. While cloisters, even to quite recent times, have always held some of the most ascetic searchers after holiness the world has seen, and the thirteenth century recluses, walled in their subterranean cells in Kiev have been matched in the nineteenth century by the hermit-colonies in St. Sergius or on the Crimean cliffs, still the life of the average monk has been less remote from the world, less abnormal, than that of the West. This has resulted in both good and ill. The more normal life of the monastic orders, with the consequent freer communication with the world at large has certainly saved Russian monasteries from much of the scandalous gossip which so often surrounds the cloisters of a West European country. With friends and relatives free to visit them in their cloister gardens, or communication by letter little less free than that in the world outside, the Russian monks have been relieved of the pressure of one circumstance which has had both ill and good effects of striking nature, in the West.

On the other hand, the emphasis upon holiness and contemplation, together with the absence of minute regulations as to daily program, in Russia have resulted in making the actual moral and material contribution of the monasteries to popular life in the last few centuries less than that of similar organizations in Western Europe. Activity has been largely confined to the monastery enclosure, and here there has oftentimes been produced less fruit of mental or physical labor than might have been expected by one who knows the tremendous energy sometimes exhibited in Western monastic life. To be sure, some monasteries are outstanding exceptions to this statement. The Solovetski Monastery on the White Sea is an example of this class. Here from the earliest times, when the most meager existence must be maintained at a cost of unending struggle with the inhospitable climate and the barren nature of the terrain, labor has always

been a prominent ideal and industry is proverbial. Beautiful examples of printing and iconography are the products of other cloisters, but on the whole their life has grown to be less practical, less productive of material benefit to the communities in which they are located than has often been the case with Western monasteries.

The Russian monasteries are to be found in every part of the land. From the bleak shores of the Arctic to the Crimean cliffs and the mountain fastnesses of the Caucasus; in the easternmost reaches of Siberia and well within the present borders of Poland: everywhere the traveller goes, he finds monasteries. Perhaps a brief description of some cloister will give a better idea of the main characteristics of Russian monastic life. Let us go to call at the Monastery of the Archangel Michael, in Archangel on the White Sea.

The great doors of its white-washed fortress-like walls, with round towers guarding its angles, swing open and you walk through the low arched entrance into an irregular quadrangle of lawn nearly surrounded with two-storied white-washed buildings. In the center is the white church with a group of painted saints on a gold background over the door. The church has two stories, the first floor is a low-vaulted room where you can almost touch the ceiling, with huge square pillars breaking its broad expanse of floor. This is the "winter church". In summer, when artificial heat is unnecessary, the lofty square room above is used for the services. Near the church is the ponderous old bell-tower, just a trifle out of plumb, with a half dozen leather thongs hanging within reach, to move the clappers of the choir of bells in the top. Now we go into the "office", a tiny musty room lined with old books and presided over by a monk who looks as though he might be at least as good a street sweeper as a keeper of accounts. On into the cloister itself, through low passsge-ways where the stone floor is

deeply furrowed by two hundred years of passing feet. Each monk has a plain little room for himself and all dine together in the "trapezium", where in front of the ikon-screen prayers or extracts from the lives of the saints are read during the whole of each meal. Then there is the carpenter shop and a tiny smithy; the basket-weaving room, and the storehouse of rude agricultural implements, for these monks go out to till the soil near their cloister in farming seasons of the year; all as simple and quiet and vaguely unproductive as your ideas of Eastern monasticism have led you to expect. Perhaps you get a peep into the museum where are treasured the copes and mitres of by-gone bishops and the chalices and croziers of the church service of two hundred years ago. You may see queer old ikons like the picture of St. Christopher, whose beauty caused him to be so troubled by the attentions of women that he prayed for a dog's head. He must have received it, for here is his picture: the body of a well-formed youth and the head of some strange sort of hound, all teeth and lolling tongue. Or you will smile as the bishop did who showed it to me, at the queer idea of God which could picture the seventh day of Creation with the Deity "resting" on a bed beneath a quilt. But the bell sounds for the Vesper service, and you hurry to the church with all the black-clad monks and the lower orders of servitors of the institution: gray old men without the black cap of the monastic vow, or younger men with woolly beards that have never known a razor and a stride that still has a trace of swagger, hampered though it be by the black gown over their heavy boots. These are also called lay brothers, though "novice" might more accurately represent their status, to a Western mind.

The service begins with the booming bass of the deacon's "Let us attend", and though it may all seem strange and unfamiliar to you of the West, you could not assert that any service you ever attended was

more truly devotional. There is a choir of men, and the chanting of the prayers brings you into a spiritual unity with these black-clad brothers which makes what a little while ago seemed uncouth and ugly appear in a new light of sincerity and faith. The frowzy old monk from the bakery, with the white marks of his profession all too evident on his black gown, is no longer an object of rather pitying amusement: you bow with him in a new but sincere form of worship to a God who is the Father of all men of every nation.

Foreign writers are often misleading when they speak of the wealth of Russian monasteries. To begin with, the monasteries do not hold the large estates they are sometimes reputed to possess. By a series of government measures beginning as early as Ivan the Terrible, the land-holdings of the black clergy have been successively reduced until they are a mere fragment of what they were in olden times. Of course, the recent total abolition of private property in Russia, withdrew at least in theory even their own buildings from the control of monastic colonies. But up to 1917 the real estate held by monasteries was not greatly in excess of what might have been termed a normal per capita apportionment. The larger and older monastic establishments, however, actually have great wealth in their "riznitsas" or historical treasuries, where jewelled ikons and gold-bound copies of the Gospel vie for richness with episcopal vestments and holy banners literally encrusted with pearls and other precious stones. Chalices and sacramental repositories of precious metal form parts of these collections, but while valued in some cases at figures which make even an American pause, (the relics in the Trinity treasury were assessed at $ 300,000,000) all this wealth is not the possession of the monks themselves. It belongs to the churches and shrines, and amidst great riches the inhabitants of many cloisters live in real poverty.

The monasteries had two principal sources of income. One, that from state subsidies, has of course ceased now, but even at the height of the old system the government grants to such establishments, considered on a per capita basis, were not very large. The other source, money derived from pilgrims to the monasteries, has always been the chief means of support of Russian monks. These funds consisted either in outright gifts or in the profits from the sale of candles and holy pictures, amounting in some cases to enormous sums. In the Pecherskaya Lavra at Kiev the countless mite boxes and little heaps of copper coin at the shrines of the holy were a constant invitation to pilgrims to give of their substance for the Church's support and netted an annual income reported to have been one and one-half million dollars. The apportionment and use of this money is typical of that in the other monasteries in Russia. A large part of it, the perquisite of the Metropolitan of Kiev, was expended for the upkeep of churches in the diocese. Schools and orphan asylums, mission work and the maintenance of charitable institutions, such as homes for the aged, each received a portion. Only a comparatively small part of the whole sum was used in the monastery itself. It has rarely been charged that monasteries spent money with undue liberality upon the living of their inmates.

But it would be giving an unfair picture of the place of Russian monasteries in the religious life of the country if one contented himself with a sketch of this regime of modest living in more or less comfortable quarters, none too strenuous an ascetic discipline and no very great contribution to the productive life of a community. It must be added that notwithstanding the apparently neutral color of this cloistered system it is none the less of real spiritual significance in the situation of today. The production of devotional literature, the edition of all sorts of religious books, the preservation of schools of antique iconography in

which we have the best examples in existence of certain forms of Byzantine art, all are contributions worthy of comment. Still more important is the educational influence of the "Academies" or higher divinity schools which in every instance are established in connection with some great monastery. And since all who attained the rank of Bishop must first have finished the course in one of these Academies, it is evident that the church leadership in this or any former generation must have been influenced in no small degree by the monastic institutions. Although, as will be noted later, many of those at present most influential in the church have been in America and are most remarkably inclined toward some phases of Western Christianity, still it is the monastic establishments which have formed the mental background of the men in whose hands rests the future of the Russian Church.

For it has been the custom since earliest times that a bishop must be chosen from among the Black Clergy. Beside this requirement and that he shall have completed the Academy, it is usually expected that before he is chosen bishop a man shall have had wide experience in less authoritative positions. Thus the present Patriarch was first an instructor, then a professor and finally rector of a theological seminary, before he received episcopal rank. The influence of the bishops of the Russian Church in this as in any other generation has been very large. Down through all the Church's history men of the highest character have filled episcopal office. A very good illustration of the place in the thoughts of the people held by some men of the episcopal rank is found in a letter from a Russian bishop, written just as the last of the Allied troops were withdrawing, leaving his city to the advancing Bolshevik armies. The usual tales of atrocities prevalent on both sides of any active front had here been circulated in profusion, and this bishop wrote to an American friend what he believed would be his

last letter. "The Americans have asked me to leave with them", he said, "but I cannot be convinced that I should try to save myself. Whatever befalls me, it cannot be said that I have deserted my people". Even if such ideals of duty were the exception, this man who lives them is a product of the monastic system, and a pastor of whom all Russian clergy may be proud.

But even though tradition requires that he be chosen from among the Black Clergy, it sometimes happens that a bishop is a noncelibate. There is an equally strong tradition that the White Clergy should be married and this has brought about a custom, dating back to a conciliar ruling of the sixteenth century, that if a parish priest is widowed, he must leave his pastorate. The usual corollary to this rule requires that he retire into a monastery. A Siberian bishop I knew is an example. Within a year after his ordination his wife died, and this man in obedience to custom entered the monastery. He was not content with simple monastic service, however, and continued his studies to the completion of the Academy. After some years of teaching and executive experience, part of which was in America, he was consecrated bishop. Some years later he paid a visit to the neighborhood of his first charge, at which time he chose to appear as an ordinary monk and omitted wearing the insignia of his episcopal rank. At a granite-dealer's he ordered a monument for the grave of his wife. The inscription was to read "Elizabeth, wife of the parish priest M.". The dealer looked at the date and then turned to his customer: "Twenty years ago", he said, "why Batioushka, if you'd tried, you might have entered the Academy and even become a bishop by now, who knows". Certain episcopal sées in Russia carried with them the rank of Archbishop. Still higher rank was that connected with three great cities, Petrograd, Moskow and Kiev, the seats of the Metropolitans. Until after

the Revolution, when the Holy Synod was dissolved, these Metropolitans represented the highest ecclesiastical rank in the Russian Church. Now for the first time since 1700 there is again a Patriarch at the head of the Russian Church who while not theoretically of greater spiritual authority is really the Primate of the Church. A more detailed study of the present Patriarch appears in the chapter on the Church since the Revolution.

Thus with all their emphasis upon prayer and holiness as the highest functions of the Christian, the monasteries of Russia are equal in historic importance if not superior to any other factor in the development of the life of the Russian people, national as well as religious. Through the great men and the high ideals they have produced; by their educational standards however faulty, still the best in Russia, they have played no small part in the development and preservation of a national spirit. As the source of all the bishops and most of the present leaders of the Russian Church they are a real force in the reconstruction of that ancient institution to face modern needs.

In passing it should be remarked that there are convents as well as monasteries in Russia. While fewer in number, they are usually larger in population, so that the total count of Russian nuns nearly equals that of the monks. The same comment which has been made in preceding paragraphs is true in general about convents as well as monasteries. Nuns usually remain more closely within their convent walls than do the monks. The black-robed and black-capped women one sees on the streets are the lay-sisters of the order: women who live approximately the same life of prayer and fasting as do the nuns, but who have not bound themselves by a vow. The fact that life in these convents consists of work as well as prayer was brought out recently in quite striking fashion in a certian Russian city where the new government sent

to an Abbess a notice that the farm belonging to her convent was to be confiscated for public distribution. The Abbess replied in a letter over which at last reports the authorities were still pondering. "It has come to our ears", she wrote, "that in the new government every worker is to receive 10 desiatines of land. Now in our Convent there are 370 sisters, women who labor with their hands, and we have but 600 desiatines. Thus it appears that, rather than give up the land which we have, we should be granted 3100 desiatines besides. For this we make petition". There is just a trace, here, of the stern insistence upon right, which has characterized the Russian Church throughout the centuries.

These paragraphs have given a very inadequate picture of the intimate interrelationship between the Russian Church and the Russian people. It is incomplete both in breadth and depth and it has noted neither all the criticisms nor all the commendation which could justly be laid at the Church's door. But perhaps it has helped to indicate what manifold effects the Church has had upon the life of Russia. From the earliest centuries until the slavery period of Synodal times, it has been the chief source of educational influence for all the people. When Russia was shrouded in the darkness of isolation under the Tatars; when the Empire was expanding to embrace a sixth of the habitable globe; in poverty and in prosperity, the Church has always been an active factor in disseminating such culture as the Russian land could boast.

There are schools in connection with almost all the benevolent institutions of the Church which embrace many sorts of public service. Orphanages and homes for the aged predominate, but hospitals and maternity homes are also included in the list. Of course there is at least one chapel or church in every such institution, and a decidedly ecclesiastical atmosphere prevails. But there is also a school wherever there are children, usually no

exception to the general drab tone of the institutions, with instruction none too plentiful or thorough. Higher ideals, public or ecclesiastical, would doubtless have resulted in better education. But if the education children received in these institutions was unsatisfactory still it was at least as good as they could have hoped for in a public school of the average village, so that the Church's teaching standards were no lower than those prevailing elsewhere.

The educational activities of the Church have in no wise been confined to the home field. As in the earlier centuries when the mission effort among barbarian tribes and Tatar and Turkish Mohammedans resulted in a wider spread of Christianity, even than it did in the extension of the Empire, so today missions of the Orthodox Church are found actively working for the propagation of the Gospel far beyond the boundaries over which the Tsar held sway. One of the finest church buildings in Tokyo is the Orthodox Cathedral where Japanese priests celebrate the Orthodox Liturgy in Japanese. This is the center of a flourishing Christian mission touching a large portion of the Japanese Empire. Missions are also to be found in China, and the fact that most of the Christian natives of Alaska are Orthodox is due also to the foreign missions of the Russian Church.

Enough has been said in the historical portions of this book to emphasize the large share the Church has had in producing the great men of Russia. Men like Philaret and Job; like St. Sergius or Nikon; men even of our own day like Father John of Kronstadt or the Patriarch Tichon; great patriots and real heroes, men of genuinely holy lives and a spirituality which compares favorably with that of great Christians of any age or nation. These are some of the characters the Orthodox Church has produced, men whose influence on the national life of Russia cannot be adequately measured. When a Tsar was afraid to go to

fight the Tatar oppressors, it was a Bishop of the Church whose fiery words shamed him into an important victory; when the Poles threatened to overrun all of Russia, it was the heroic defence of the monks in the Sergievsky Monastery which rallied their despairing countrymen; when the nation was torn by dissensions over the False Dmitris it was the Church which met the need for a unifying force and held the people together until order was restored. So powerful an influence it was in the Russian nation that Peter the Great who stopped at no scruples to strengthen the monarch's power seized upon it as a potential force in his governmental system and made it an unwilling servant of the autocrat's will. And in spite of those two hundred years of servitude, the Church today is still the Church of the Russian people.

One day in the troubled Spring of 1918, when the question was so often raised by Russian folk if the Allied nations would not come in to help restore order, I was calling on the Patriarch. The third session of the National Church Council was in progress and we had been speaking of its work. "Why couldn't America come in and help restore order in Russia?" the Patriarch demanded, suddenly changing the subject. I raised the classic objection that no outside power could properly intervene without an official invitation from some authority which truly represented the people. In an instant the Patriarch answered "The Council will give you an invitation: it comprises the duly elected delegates from eighty percent of all the Russian people. Can you ask a better representative assembly?" It was said half in jest, but it was true in a very real sense. As no other force in Russian life or any Christian influence in any other nation's history, the Church has been interwoven in every development of the Russian nation. Political, religious, educational: in every phase of the nation's growth the Church has been not merely widely influential: it has been a prime

factor. No wonder the peasant thinks of himself as Russian and as Orthodox, all in the same breath. It is his national Church; every circumstance of his life is connected in some way or other with its observances or its tradition. Primitive and unprogressive it may have been, but it has met all the demands that he has made upon it. It is bound up with his life, personal and national, historic and present. In a sense unmatched in all the world it is the Church of a great nation, the soul of the Russian Folk.

CHAPTER IX.

A SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE.

"To know Russia", someone has said, "you must see both the Church and the Bazaar". It is Sunday morning and while we might find some sections of the market open, still we pass it by in favor of a visit to the church. We shall not have to go far, for wherever you are in Russia, there is certain to be a church nearby. It may be set at the intersection of two of Moskow's winding streets, with a patch of lawn about it, or it may be the most prominent feature of some country landscape with its bright green roof and gilded cupola the only spot of color in the whole drab village. Wherever it be, you will find, in marked contrast to the dim coldness of many of our western churches, that the Russian church building offers the richest picture of light and color to be found anywhere. It is the most cheerful, instead of the most gloomy spot in the community.

The place of worship we have chosen is perhaps the "Church of the Resurrection" or the "Church of the Holy Elijah" or "The Trinity Church". All Orthodox churches are named after the particular holy person or event in whose honor they are built, but a certain small list of names is so popular that one often finds several churches in a given city bearing the same principal title. To distinguish these one from another, sub-titles have been added, usually connected with some distinctive circumstance such as site or shape and one comes upon such delightfully suggestive names as "The Church of St. Nicholas of the Green Cross" or "The Church of the Ascension on the

Red Sands". "The Church of the Assumption which is Built upon the Graves", in Moskow, stands at one end of the little "Street of the Dead", both names probably reminiscent of some long-forgotten burial ground.

Our church is perhaps of red brick though it may be of whitewashed plaster instead, square or oblong in shape, with a bay or apse on its eastern side and the great door at the west. Perhaps there is a bell tower over the entrance. It is not an essential part of the "temple", but usually stands beside it. The roof is painted green or grey with a number of gold or blue or green cupolas or domes above it. In shape they are like nothing so much as smooth turnips, turned upside down, with gold crosses where the long tap-root should be. There are many theories as to the architectural derivation of this most characteristic feature of every Russian landscape, but the authorities seem not to agree, and we may let the matter rest until they do. Be their origin what it may, these bulbous domes of green or gold have a very definite significance.

The Russian wedding service is called "the Crowning", because when a pair stand before the priest for the ceremony, gold and jewelled crowns are held over their heads by the two groomsmen. Now each Russian church building, the old books explain, must have a gold crown, for is not the church the bride of Christ? So gold is the favorite color for these crown-shaped cupolas, and the idea may explain their curious form, but the symbolism breaks when we find not one but three or five of these "Crowns" on a single church building. Explanations of these various groupings of little domes are not wanting, however. If there is but one cupola, that reminds the worshipper that God is one. If two, they stand for the Father and the Savior: if there are three domes, they symbolize the Trinity; four represent the four Evangelists and a fifth added to these is significant of the Savior in their

midst. There may be more than five, sometimes a whole bouquet of little gold domes, like those on the roof of the "Church of Our Savior Behind the Golden Gates", in the Kremlin. No matter how many cupolas there are, each must be crowned by the Holy Cross, with its three transverse bars instead of one, as we of the West are used to see it. To the Russian, this "eight-pointed cross" is the true symbol. The peasant has a derogatory slang-word for the Latin cross, and regards it as a caricature of his own. To make the Byzantine symbol there are added a shorter transversal above the usual bar of the Latin cross, which represents the "titulus" or board of superscription placed above the head of the crucified Savior, and a still shorter one placed slantwise, lower down, probably symbolizing the foot block on the Cross of Salvation.

The entrance to the church is usually at the west side, for if it is at all possible the altar and the more sacred parts of the temple are at the eastern extremity. Where a church is built on the west side of a north-and-south street, one sometimes finds the entrance gate leading into a little passageway which goes around the building to the west side; a front door in the back of the church.

Within the outer doors of any Russian church there is a little vestibule which is indicative of more than merely a desire to keep out the winter drafts. Although now fallen into disuse, it is a relic of the early Christian times when "the Porch" was that part of the church reserved for unbaptized and excommunicated persons. To this day, part of the wonderful service on the night before Easter is performed in the vestibule, as it was sixteen centuries ago in the porches of Byzantium.

But the people crowding past, remind us that the service is about to begin and we go on into the church itself. The church is probably full, with women on the left side and men on the right, although there

is no rigid separation: all are standing, for the Orthodox Church recognizes but two postures fitting for the worship of God, standing or kneeling, and seats are provided only for the aged or infirm. We step to a place near the middle of the room, to be able to see all that goes on. A faint odor of incense, the smell of burning wax, the drone of a reader with little phrases of song from a choir, gold-haloed saints and richly decorated walls: these are first impressions. The reading indicates that we have arrived in time for the more interesting parts of the whole service, which is divided into three sections. The first, the "Office of Oblation", is a ceremony performed almost entirely behind the altar screen, while "The Hours" are being read in the main body of the church. At this time the priests are robing themselves and preparing the bread and wine for the communion service which forms the third part of the Liturgy. The second part is called the Liturgy of the Catechumens and consists in prayer and worship preparatory to the Communion service itself.

The "hours" which the reader is intoning are long selections from the Psalms, interspersed with various hymns to God and to the saints. To foreign ears it sounds quite uninteresting, and so we have time to look about us at the church building itself.

Gothic cathedrals, with their long naves, were built for the celebration of the service where the people looked on at a performance. The Russian church, however, is usually square, with the altar-screen and the place for a speaker in full view from every part of the room, and we shall see, as the service goes on, that here the worshippers themselves participate in many portions of the ritual. With the exception of churches like the Kazan Cathedral in Petrograd, built after western designs, Russian churches are far better adapted for preaching than are the long aisles of gothic architecture.

That part of the church where we stand is a large clear room with the eastern third separated from the main portion of the building by the altar-screen, really a partition almost completely dividing the church into two parts. This essential feature of every Russian church is an Eastern development of the altar-rail which persists in many Protestant churches of today and in English cathedrals has become the rood-screen. In early times it was the custom to place the holy pictures against the altar-railing, and as the number of pictures, ("ikons"), grew, the rail was metamorphosed into a solid wall, and its name became "ikonostas", literally a "picture-stand". The space behind this screen known as the Sanctuary, is considered the most holy part of the temple. Here is the altar, with the Holy and Life-giving Cross set up on it, and a gold-bound copy of the Gospels. In the general significance of the service the Sanctuary typifies heaven, with the altar as God's throne out from which light and salvation proceed to men in the world, represented in the body of the church. No woman may enter the Sanctuary, and through the central doors, called the "Royal Gate", because through it at the celebration of the Liturgy the King of Glory comes forth to men, only ordained men may pass.

Just in front of the altar-screen there is a platform raised a step or two above the floor, with a strip of bright flowered carpet leading up the middle of it to the Royal Gate, also known as the "Holy Doors". On the doors and across the whole breadth of the screen are row on row of pictures: saints and angels and scenes from holy writ, placed apparently at random, but really following an order carefully established for all churches. The doors bear a representation of the Annunciation, for through that event the Son of God came from heaven to be among men. The first picture at the right is that of the Savior; the first at the left, of His mother.

Above the Holy Doors must be placed a painting of the Last Supper and there is a definitely prescribed order for all the other pictures on the screen. At either side of the Royal Gate are smaller doors opening into the Sanctuary and bearing pictures of angels, the messengers of God. If it is a large church, perhaps there are side chapels each with their Royal Gates and "north and south doors".

The Holy Gates represent the channels of communion between God and men, and each opening or closing has some real significance in the service. The Saturday evening Vespers for example, portray the whole of Bible history in the symbolism of open or closed gates. The services begin with doors open, in memory of that time before the Fall when there was no barrier between God and men. A little later, however, the doors are closed, and the deacon praying with bowed head outside them, represents Adam sorrowing before the gates of Paradise. The next time the doors are opened it is a portrayal of the birth of the Savior, and when they are closed again, of His death. Another time the gates swing wide and all men remember the Resurrection when Christ came back to His people.

At either side of the Holy Doors, at the front of the platform, are jewelled banners, each with a picture of some Christian hero of the past. Russians do not sing "Onward Christian Soldiers", but if they did, here are the banners of the Faith, all ready for the march. These banners are used in church processions out of doors on great festivals, but have no special place in this morning's service. The reader drones on, with every now and then a choral response, in wonderfully moving harmony. This choral music represents what was originally the response of all the congregation; a fact which is constantly brought to your mind by the way in which people join in with the singing. You may suddenly become conscious of a huge bass humming as some man near you adds his bit of music,

in time with the choir. Occasionally some worshipper steps forward to set a lighted taper before one of the pictured saints in the altar-screen or at the sides of the room. Perhaps he kisses the pictured image, crossing himself reverently as he does so. If the church is so filled as to make it inconvenient to go forward, the tapers are relayed up toward the front, from hand to hand, each tapping someone ahead of him on the shoulder to attract his attention. It makes no difference if he be the meanest peasant or the most haughty aristocrat, he is likely to feel the little tap of the candles on his shoulder, and hear a whispered "please" as tapers pass up from the rear. Before God all men are equal, and in God's house there can be no distinctions. The candles for church use must be of pure beeswax, typifying the sacrifice of prayer, offered to or through the saint before whose image they are placed.

If we were in a cathedral church, we could witness the interesting ceremony of the robing of the bishop as he stands on the dais in the center of the church. With a deftness acquired from long practice the attendants remove the bishop's cowl, his mantle and outer cassock, and robe him in garments of stiff gold brocade and place the jewelled mitre upon his head, swift fingers putting upon him in a few moments robes which would take half an hour if he donned them unaided.

But here the Holy Doors are opened and the deacon standing before them begins the service. You can distinguish the deacon from the priest by his wide sleeves and especially by the long narrow stole, one end of which he holds in his right hand, usually making with it the sign of the cross on a level with his face as he repeats "Let us pray to the Lord". The deacon has been chosen to this position because of his voice, and his rolling bass intones "Bless, Master", and the choir sings an Amen to the priest's blessing. The deacon

then recites a series of prayers known as the "Great Litany" each closing with "Let us pray to the Lord", and to each the choir responds "Lord have mercy" ("Gospodee pomilui"), the antiphon one hears a hundred times in every service. One or two examples will serve to indicate the beauty of the prayers the deacon is chanting: "For the peace that is from above, and for the salvation of our souls, let us pray to the Lord"; "For the peace of the whole world, for the welfare of God's holy churches and the union of them all". With true Russian compassion, every worshipper reverently makes the sign of the cross as the deacon prays for "the sick and suffering; for those who are in captivity and for their salvation". When the great Litany is finished, and the priest has sung "For unto Thee are due all glory... Father, Son and Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto ages of ages", the choir sings Amen and follows it by chanting the First Antiphon, usually the 103rd Psalm. ("Bless the Lord, O my soul...")

Again the deacon sounds the call to prayer and recites what is known as the "Little Litany", a shorter series of petitions, with choral responses as before. This is followed with an Exclamation by the priest, and the second antiphon, after which the whole Little Litany is again chanted. Then the deacon retires to the Sanctuary while the choir sings the beautiful "In thy Kingdom remember us, O Lord", and the Beatitudes, with every worshipper following the words and many humming an accompaniment.

Now the north door opens and the procession called the "Lesser Entrance" appears: preceded by a lighted taper, the deacon bears the Holy Gospel out into the church, followed by the priests and attendants. The Gospels represent the divinity of Christ and the light which accompanies it signifies the illumination of His holy Word. (If a bishop is participating, the whole service is more elaborate. We are here describing a service one might witness in any Russian Church).

While the choir sings "O come let us worship and fall down before Christ", the priest and deacon enter the Holy Doors and deposit the book upon the altar.

The "Tropari", hymns for the day, follow, while the priest prays in secret. Then the deacon appears at the Holy Doors and the choir sings the "Thrice Holy Hymn": "O Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal One, have mercy upon us".

A bit of dialogue between the priest and reader follows, and the deacon's exclamation "Wisdom!" announces the "Gradual" a set of verses to precede or "lead up to" the reading of the scripture lesson. These verses are read and chanted by deacon and choir and at the close the reader announces the Epistle: "The Lesson from the Epistle of the Holy Apostle.... to the...", and the deacon exclaims "Let us attend!"

While the Epistle is being read, or intoned, with the reader beginning softly, very low in the scale and gradually rising in a sort of continuous portamento, with a steady increase in volume until the last words are proclaimed in the biggest voice at his command, the deacon takes the censer and censes the altar, the sanctuary and the people. This is in preparation for the reading of the Gospel, and typifies the permeating sweetness of the Holy Spirit.

When the Epistle is finished and the deacon has received a blessing from the priest, he comes out from the Holy Door, saying: "Wisdom, O believers. Let us listen to the holy Gospel", and the choir sings "Glory to Thee, O Lord".

Now you will hear the most striking performance of intonation in the whole service, as the deacon reads the Gospel lesson. Beginning as did the reader, at the lowest note he can sound, the deacon's voice grows in volume, and rises higher and higher as the lesson proceeds until at the end the whole church vibrates with the ringing wonder of the Gospel.

"Peace be unto thee, who hast announced the good tidings", the priest says, and the choir sings a Gloria.

Here, if there is to be a sermon, (and since the Revolution it has come to be the almost universal custom), the priest steps out to the front of the platform and signs himself with the cross. Watch the people crowd up around their pastor, intent to hear whatever message he has to bring them from the Gospel which has just been read. Perhaps he begins in the old style fashion, "My children —": it seems particularly appropriate. The way the people gather about him is like nothing so much as children at a story-hour; the same interest, the same uplifted faces. It is a real pastoral message, and though some of our American churches might excel it in pulpit eloquence, they could not point to a congregation displaying more genuine attention to every word of it.

Again the deacon appears, and another Litany is said, with the choir responding "Lord have mercy", as before.

When it is ended, the Litany of the Catechumens follows, with special prayer for all those about to join the church's communion. And then the deacon makes an exclamation which translates us in spirit back to the earliest Christian centuries, when only the tested members of the brotherhood were permitted to witness and partake of the "Holy Mysteries", as the Eucharist is called to this day. Before the celebration of the Lord's Supper, it was the custom in those early times to cause all the "Catechumens" or persons in training for reception into the church to leave the place of meeting, completing the service with "The Faithful" behind closed doors. As a direct inheritance of this second-century custom the deacon exclaims "Depart all ye Catechumens! Let no Catechumen remain! But let us who are in the faith, again... pray unto the Lord". The remainder of the morning

service is known therefore, as the "Liturgy of the Faithful".

It begins with the recital of the "Great Litany" as in the earlier part of the service. Prayers for "the peace of the whole world", "the union of God's holy churches": "For all those who..... in devoutness and the fear of God have entered this temple", and closing with "Succor us, save us, have mercy upon us, and keep us, O God, by thy grace".

There is a sudden hush all through the church and across it there floats out the most beautiful anthem of the whole service, as the choir sings the "Cherubimic Hymn": "Let us, who mystically represent the Cherubim, intoning unto the Life-giving Trinity the thrice-holy hymn, now lay aside all earthly care....."

While they sing, there appears from the north door the procession known as the "Great Entrance". Preceded by lights and the holy fans, the deacon enters, bearing on his head the paten with the communion bread. After him comes a priest with the chalice, followed by other priests, if there be others, who carry crosses, or some of the implements from the table of preparation. The bread and wine are as yet unconsecrated, and are carried through the Holy Doors to be placed upon the altar, after the procession has stopped, facing the congregation, to pronounce a prayer for all ministers of God, for all rulers, and for all true Christian people, everywhere.

Now the choir completes the Cherubimic Hymn: "That we may raise on high the King of All, like a conqueror on shields and spears, by Angelic Hosts invisibly upborne", and the priest entering the Holy Doors places the chalice upon the altar, and taking the bread from the deacon's hand sets it beside the cup while the deacon announces: "Let us complete our prayer unto the Lord", and the Litany repeats many of the petitions already offered, with certain

additions: "A day all-perfect, holy, peaceful and sinless, let us beseech of the Lord", "The pardon and remission of our sins and transgressions" — "A Christian ending to our life, painless, blameless, peaceful; and a good defence before the dread judgment seat of Christ, let us beseech of the Lord".

The choir sings "Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the Trinity one in essence and undivided", and then the deacon exclaims "The Doors, the Doors!" in memory of those earliest Christian times when none but the faithful were permitted to hear the Creed or partake of the Holy Supper. The choir now begins the solemn chant of the "Symbol of Faith" as the Nicene Creed is called, with all the people joining in: "I believe..." and so on through all that grand old confession.

While this is being sung the priest at the altar is fanning the "Holy Gifts", the bread and wine, with the silken cloth which was used to cover them. Now he turns to the people:

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be with you all".

To which the choir replies, "And with thy Spirit".

The priest: "Lift up your hearts".

The choir: "We lift them up unto the Lord".

The priest: "Let us give thanks unto the Lord".

And the choir sings the "Dostoino Yest": "Meet and right it is that we should adore the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.....", while the priest, secretly, recites a long prayer closing with an exclamation to which the choir replies in a burst of song: "Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Sabaoth: Heaven and earth are full of thy Glory: Hosanna in the highest: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord".

Then with bowed head the priest recites the words of ordination of the sacrament and the choir sings Amens, after which the priest exclaims: "Thine own, of thine own, we offer unto thee, in behalf of all, and

for all". Crossing his hands, the deacon lifts high above his head the Holy Gifts, replacing them on the altar while the choir sings:

"We praise thee, we bless thee, we give thanks unto thee, O Lord, and we pray unto thee, O our God".

A silence falls on the whole assembly, for now there is to take place the mystic transubstantiation of the Holy Gifts into the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, and with bowed heads the people listen to the words of consecration:

Deacon: "Bless, Master, the holy bread".

Priest: "And make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ".

Deacon: "Amen. Bless, Master, the holy chalice".

Priest: "And make that which is in this chalice the precious blood of Thy Christ".

Deacon: "Amen. Master, bless both".

Priest: "Transmuting them by Thy Holy Spirit".

Deacon: "Amen, Amen, Amen".

And all bow in reverence before the Holy things, while in a hymn of praise the choir gives adoration to the Virgin: "Meet is it in truth, to bless thee, the Birth-giver of God, ever-blessed, and all undefiled, and the Mother of our God. More honourable than the Cherubim, and beyond compare more glorious than the Seraphim, thou who without defilement barest God the Word, true Birth-giver of God, we magnify thee".

Then while all the bells sound, that those who could not come to church may know the holy Sacrifice has been performed, the deacon leads the congregation in prayer: "Have in remembrance, O Lord, this city in which we dwell; and every city and country, and all those who with faith dwell therein. Have in remembrance, O Lord, all those who journey by sea or by land, all sick persons and sufferers and captives, and their salvation. Have in remembrance, O Lord, these who bear fruit and do good works in Thy holy

Churches, and those who are mindful of the poor; and send down Thy grace upon us all", followed by a Litany similar to the first in the Liturgy of the Faithful.

At an exclamation from the priest, the people kneel and all chant together the Lord's Prayer, as far as "For thine is the kingdom.....", which the priest exclaims as the congregation rises from its knees.

An Amen from the choir, then the Holy Door is closed and the curtain drawn, while the priests within the Sanctuary take communion. The ritual for this service is minutely exact, with every detail carefully fixed. While this is being done, the choir sings a communion hymn.

Now the Holy Door is opened and the deacon carrying the chalice in which are mingled the Wine and the Bread, accompanies the priest out through the Holy Door, and the deacon elevating the Cup, says "In the fear of God and with faith, draw near". And all the people who wish to partake of the communion approach and receive from a golden spoon in the hand of the priest, the Body and Blood, while for each person the choir sings: "Receive ye the Body of Christ; taste ye the Fountain of Life".

As each communicant finishes, he steps to a side table where other bread, called "antidoron", "instead of the Gifts", and a cup with warm water are set for him to partake of, a custom dating back to the time when this unconsecrated bread was offered to those who had not sufficiently prepared themselves for partaking of the Holy Gifts.

When the communion is finished, the choir sings "Alleluia", as the priest returns the chalice to the altar, then two hymns of praise to God for His goodness in permitting us to partake of the Holy Supper, while the deacon, taking the paten on his head, and swinging the censer, moves over to the table of preparation and there sets the paten down.

After this the deacon standing before the Holy Door, recites another brief Litany of thanksgiving, and the priest comes out from the Sanctuary to read the "Prayer before the Tribune".

"O Lord, who blessest those who bless thee, and sanctifiest those who put their trust in thee: Save thy people and bless thine inheritance. Preserve the fullness of the Church; sanctify those who love the beauty of thy house; glorify them in recompense with thy divine might, and forsake not us who set our hope on thee. Give peace to thy world, and to thy Churches, and to thy priests... and to all thy people. For every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh from thee, the Father of Lights. And unto thee we ascribe glory, and thanksgiving, and worship, to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit...".

In America this prayer is often read in English, even if every other part of the service is performed in the old Slavonic. At the close of this prayer the choir sings, "Amen....Blessed be the Name of the Lord, henceforth and forever..". And the reader recites the 34th Psalm, "I will bless the Lord at all times".

While this is being done the deacon must consume such portions of the Holy Gifts as remain unused, and carefully wiping all the vessels, set them reverently aside.

And when the reading is ended the priest says: "The blessing of the Lord, through his grace and love toward mankind, be upon you always, now, and ever, and unto ages of ages".

Choir: "Amen".

Priest: "Glory to thee, O Christ our God; glory to thee".

Choir: "Glory to the Father, and to the Son....".

Then the priest recites the Benediction: "May He who rose from the dead, Christ, our true God, through the prayers of his all-holy Mother, of our

fathers among the Saints, of Saint N. (of the Temple), of Saint N. (of the day), of the holy and righteous Ancestors of God, Joachim and Anna, and of all the Saints, have mercy upon us and save us, for he is good and loveth mankind", and standing at the edge of the platform he holds out the cross for all who wish to kiss as they go home. The Holy Doors are closed and the public part of the service is over. A post-communion prayer is recited, as priest and deacon conclude their service behind the altar-screen, but people rarely stay for it.

If you wish, you may go up to kiss the Holy and Life-giving Cross, and then we leave the church. We have witnessed a service more closely resembling the Christian worship of the second and third centuries, than any other in the world. An American, visiting a Russian church once remarked, "It is true religion to be sure, but is it Christianity?" Perhaps it is not just like that which we of the practical West have been taught to consider the highest form of the religion of Christ, but now we are certain that we have never known before all the possibilities of the devotional side of that faith. Even when we did not understand the words of the Liturgy, our hearts have been lifted with the solemn worship and the moving music of the choir. We have caught a new vision of the breadth of our religion, and in a new sense we realize how men of all lands are united in His praise.

Note: The orthodox ritual is so flexible that a brief manual absolutely valid for every celebration of the Eastern Liturgy is impracticable. Nevertheless, this chapter has been designed to be used in the church as a guide and explanation for the average Sunday morning service.

CHAPTER X.

BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

When the Allied forces landed in Archangel and a military front was created between that city and Moskow, the Bishop of Archangel was attending a church council on the southern side of the line and could not get back to the diocese, so the Bishop next in rank was called from his monastery in a small town in the interior of the province to come and occupy the vacant place. People in his quiet retreat had a very limited contact with the great world outside, so the new Bishop of Archangel was not very well acquainted with foreigners or with Western forms of religion. When first I went to see him, he was evidently at a loss to account for the friendly attitude of a member of another confession, and I had to stand a sort of doctrinal examination. "You are not Pravoslavny" (Orthodox)?

"No; Presbyterian".

"Then you stand by the Filioque?"

Well of course, away back in our history we are derived from the Western half of Christianity, which accepted that theory, but I explained that so far as I was personally concerned the presence or absence in the Creed of the Filioque clause was not of great significance. The great things all Christians have in common are so much more important than those lesser things which divide them. The Bishop was evidently impressed, but still not entirely at ease about the matter: "But of course you have the seven sacraments?" he went on.

And after I had to confess that in our church we recognized only two, it took long months of acquaintance to convince him that there could be real Christianity in America.

"The Faith of the Holy Orthodox Church", says an old church book, "is based upon the Holy Scriptures, the Nicene Creed, the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the Seven Sacraments". In every service of the Liturgy the "Symbol of Faith" as the Creed is called, is chanted by the whole assembly. This ancient exposition of the faith accepted by the first Ecumenical Council (Nicea, 325 A. D.) belongs to all Christian faiths, antedating the "Apostles Creed" more commonly in use in churches in America.

"I believe in One God the Father, Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made;

Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary, and was made man;

And was crucified also for us, under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried;

And rose again the third day according to the Scripture;

And ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father;

And He shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son, together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets.

I believe in one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.

I look for the resurrection of the dead;

And the life of the world to come. Amen."

To some modern Protestants, this Creed seems stiff and formal and the nice precision of all the definitions, forced and needless; but go to the church and hear it sung, with all the people joining in, and you are carried back in spirit to that tremendous conflict at Nicea for what the fathers regarded as the essentials of the Christian faith. God must have come down to men, they believed, else salvation was impossible, and the triumph of Athanasius over the Arians was celebrated in this classic monument to one of the greatest victories ever won for Christianity. In Dean Stanley's admirable Lectures on the Eastern Church, the great Council of Nicea is made to live again and we almost see the venerable Creed in the making.

"A Sacrament, or Mystery", says the Russian Catechism, "is a holy act through which grace, or in other words the saving power of God, works mysteriously upon men".....'The Sacraments are seven; Baptism, Unction with Chrism (Confirmation), Communion, Penitence, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction with Oil (Extreme Unction)".

The ritual for the sacrament of Baptism and Confirmation is an inheritance from earliest Christian times, when converts to the new religion were all adults, so it provides simply for the baptism of grown persons.

For many centuries in Russia, however, it has been customary to baptize infants, the ceremony generally occurring on the eighth day after a child's birth. The child is brought to the church by its father, for the mother is considered impure for forty days after the child is born, and a solemn service is performed

which involves the triple immersion of the babe and its anointing with "chrism", a specially prepared oil compounded only in Moskow, and there prepared in silver vessels but once in a year. This anointing signifies that the babe is a member of Christ's Church, and it is customary for children who have been thus received to partake of communion without previous confession until they reach the age of seven, after which the rite of confession is obligatory. After the child has been anointed the priest shears a lock of its hair, a token of obedience to God, and reminiscent of early Christian times when the shearing of the hair was a universal sign of submission.

The mode of administering the Eucharist in the Russian Church has been described in the preceding chapter. It is administered, of course, only to Orthodox persons. As one of the highest honors the Church could grant to the American Diplomatic Mission in 1917, some of its members were admitted to the Sanctuary during the Liturgy, and there received the Holy Gifts, a privilege formerly accorded only to ordained persons and the Tsar himself. The average Russian takes communion at least once a year, in the week preceding Easter, although the Church, while having no canonical rule on the subject, urges that each Christian should receive this sacrament four times yearly.

In the legally-minded West, the Church of the middle ages found the sacrament of Penitence, or Confession, a most powerful means of influencing and holding its people. Confession in the Eastern Church has never been such a fearful thing. Stand in the church any Sunday during Lent and watch people come to the priest for confession. He stands before a little table on which lie a cross and a copy of the gospel. The penitent kisses both and bows his head while the priest covers it with his stole. A prayer is said and then the Admonition: "Behold, child, Christ stands

here invisibly to receive thy confession. Be not ashamed or afraid, and conceal nothing from me; but without hesitation tell me what thou hast done, and receive absolution from Jesus Christ. I am only a witness, and certify before Him all that thou tellest me. . ."

Then a number of questions are asked, at the discretion of the priest, to which the penitent responds "I have sinned" or "I have not sinned", as he feels himself guilty or not, of wrongful deeds mentioned. And when the penitent has completed his confession and expressed a desire to lead a new life, the priest recites the Formula of Absolution: "May our Lord Jesus Christ by the grace and bounty of His love to all mankind, pardon thee, child, of all thy sins: and I, unworthy priest that I am, by the authority given me, do forgive and absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit". Then the penitent kisses the Book and the cross, and perhaps the hand of the priest, and after registering in the deacon's book, goes his way.

It is a simple service, with no suggestion of an "anatomy of vice carried to the length of.... vivisection" as Leroy-Beaulieu, himself a Catholic, describes that rite in the Roman Catholic Church. There are no little "sentry boxes" as the confessionals were dubbed by a Russian pilgrim who accidentally wandered into a Catholic Church in Kiev. Beside this absence of secrecy, the non-celibacy of the priest is another safeguard against the abuse of the confessional even in the more searching form in which it exists among the "Old Believers". That the rite is more than a mere form, however, with real confession, and real sincerity in the priest, may be indicated by a delightfully revealing incident from the memoirs of a priest of the Old Believers, in the time of Peter the Great. He tells how a woman came to confess "gross sins, fornication and every nastiness.... standing before the Holy

Gospels.....Then I, thrice accursed, I, healer of souls, even I caught the infection, and the consuming fire of desire entered my heart. That was a hard struggle. I lit three candles and stuck them on the desk, and then I held my hand in the flame, until the impure fire within me was extinguished". This is perhaps a rare instance: certainly one does not often witness in a modern Russian church a confession scene so animated, but it is an indication of the sincerity of the rite, although the whole institution is far simpler than the same sacrament in the Catholic Church, and has never been used for the "spiritual direction" which characterized the Roman Church of the seventeenth century and still lingers in less rigorous form in the Catholic Church of today.

The sacrament of "Holy Orders", of course, includes the ordination of all those who serve in the church, readers, deacons, priests and bishops. The rules and ritual for consecrating these different orders of church servitors are inherited from the ancient past. Most of them have been outlined in the section on the Clergy. As the majority of all clergy are married men and heads of families, they are less removed from the life of the people, more truly citizens of their communities: in closer sympathy with all phases of public life, than otherwise might be the case. There is also the possibility that a priest may be released from his vows and restored to civil life. This privilege, however, is so rarely exercised as to be an almost negligible factor. Still it is an indication of the far greater nearness of the Orthodox priest to the life of his people than that of a priest of Rome, with his irrevocable ordination and his vow of celibacy.

The Sacrament of Marriage in a Russian Church is a decidedly interesting affair. All sorts of antique customs survive in the usage both in the ceremony itself and in the preparation for it by friends of both parties. There must be several attendants: at least

two groomsmen and an attendant for the bride, whose parents by invariable custom never attend the ceremony. The bride, dressed much as American brides, is escorted to the church by an attendant of the groom, and met at the church door by her future husband. A reading desk, with a copy of the Gospels and a holy picture upon it, has been set up in the center of the Church. As the bridal pair enter, the Holy Doors are opened and the choir sings a joyful hymn. The ceremony has two parts, the Betrothal, and the Wedding proper.

It opens with a beautiful Litany, during which bride and groom hold in their hands lighted tapers decorated with silver ribbon. In many houses one sees these wedding tapers preserved with the household ikons, and there used to be a superstition that the person whose candle was the shorter at the close of the ceremony, would be the first to die. When the Litany is finished, the priest, taking the two gold rings which have been used during the engagement, and were placed on the altar at the beginning of the ceremony makes with one of them the sign of the cross over the head of the groom, saying "The Servant of God, N. is betrothed to the Servant of God, A., in the Name...etc." and then gives the ring to the bridegroom. The same thing is done for the bride with the other ring, after which the couple exchange rings three times, and a long prayer by the priest concludes the Betrothal.

Another swell of music from the choir is followed by an exhortation by the priest, explaining the Sacrament of Marriage and enjoining virtuous and honorable lives in the wedded state. A pink rug, its color symbolic of the path of happiness now opening for the couple, is placed before the lectern, and the bridal pair stand upon it. There is an old saying that whoever first sets foot upon the rosy cloth will rule the household.

Now the priest asks each in turn if he or she has a "good, free and unconstrained will and a firm inten-

tion" to take this person for wife (or husband) with the additional question "Thou hast not promised thyself to any other?", and the groom's attendants raise above the heads of the bridal pair two large gilt crowns ornamented with jewels and holy medallions. These crowns were formerly worn by the bridal pair, but it has come to be the custom simply to hold them above their heads, no small task if the ceremony is an hour long, as often happens. A long Liturgy and three long prayers follow, then the priest takes the crown in his hands and makes the sign of the cross over the heads of the bride and groom, saying as he does so "The servant of God, N., is crowned with the handmaid of God A"., or the converse, and concludes with the solemn prayer that the Lord "will crown them both with glory and honor".

Now a cup with water and wine is brought and given to both to sip, in memory of the Wedding in Cana of Galilee and in token that as they share this cup, so must they share all life's portions, good or ill. Then the priest taking a silk handkerchief, binds the hands of bride and groom together and leads them three times around the lectern, stopping after each circuit for a brief prayer. It is interesting to note that the ceremony may be legally interrupted and considered as not binding, any time before the third circle about the reading desk has been made. After that the pair are legally wed. Another short prayer and the benediction follows and the ceremony is finished.

The Seventh Sacrament corresponds to the Extreme Unction of the Roman Catholic Church, and is supposed to be performed in the last hours of a person's life, when death is believed inevitable. It differs from the Roman usage in that this anointing is also performed, sometimes, as part of a service of prayer for the healing of the sick person.

Three other differences from the Roman Church are worth noting. The Orthodox Church does not be-

lieve in Indulgences. Its teaching about Purgatory is not that of the Roman Church; and while it regards the Mother of God as "worthy of honor before all saints", it has no dogma of her Immaculate Conception.

When one enters upon a discussion of the reverence for holy persons and holy pictures in the Orthodox Church, he is opening a subject of thought quite foreign to the average Protestant. It is only bigotry, however, which without examination will reject as useless that which forms a part of another's mode of worship, simply because it does not coincide with his own forms of religion. Only when one consciously makes the effort to "feel with" them, as the Russian phrase has it, can he truly come to even an approximation of comprehending what this reverence for the great and holy lives of past times means, in the religious life of another people. Once the Rector of a theological seminary in Russia spoke to a group of Americans, attempting to let them glimpse the inner significance of this honor paid to saints, and possibly nothing could better represent the Russian thought on this subject than some paragraphs from that lecture. The rector was speaking of "some people, long since dead, but whom the Russian counts as living", and powerful advocates at God's throne:

"In the first instance, one must speak of Saint Nicholas, the Wonder-worker, who lived at the beginning of the fourth century, in the times when martyrdom had just passed and when peace had been brought to the world. There are hundreds of churches all over Russia built in honor of this very much loved saint. His holidays are celebrated with special ceremony, for they are very dear occasions to the Russian people. Why is it that they love and respect Saint Nicholas so much? The Russian people have suffered much, and in this suffering they have sought an advocate and comforter. They have found this in the person of Saint Nicholas.

"Saint Nicholas fed the hungry: how many hungry people there have been in Russia! Saint Nicholas gave alms to the poor secretly: and how many poor there have been in Russia who have wished that even in secret someone might have given them something for their poverty! The Russian has been called upon to suffer injustice, even from his own authorities: Saint Nicholas in his day saved many from suffering, rescued them from unjust punishment, often holding back a sword from the neck of an innocent person. Russia needed a protector who could truly command divine power. This kind of protector they found in Saint Nicholas, who performed countless miracles by the aid of power from above. He saved people from drowning; he rescued them from death; he healed the sick. That is the kind of a protector which the Russian people need. They speak of him in two endearing terms — either "Saint Nicholas the Wonder-worker" or "Saint Nicholas the Merciful". It is significant that this feeling of admiration exists not only among Christian people but among the wild tribes of Siberia, who although they are not Christians, on the day of Saint Nicholas' feast buy a candle and place it before his shrine in the church and pray together with Christians to Saint Nicholas".

Who shall presume to deny the inspiration of a holy life? If one part of Christendom elects to single out certain great characters for special reverence, it surely is not fitting for another part to deny altogether the value of such a custom. Saint Nicholas, although born in Asia Minor, is probably the favorite Saint of Russians, but they revere almost equally, other holy lives, of their own land, and almost within their own time. Let the Rector tell you of Saint Seraphim of Sarov.

"It would be impossible to mention the favorite saints of Russia without calling special attention to the holy Seraphim who lived in the Government of

Tambov. The body of this saint does not remain to us uncorrupted, but his spirit still lives in the lives of the Russian people and they like to think of him and meditate on the holy life he lived. He was especially noted for the remarkable purity and fineness of his spirit. The Russian people think of him always in connection with the flaming Seraphim in the heavens. He was filled with the same kind of spirit which the archangel himself must have: the same spirit of gladness and eternal joy which must be his who lives before the face of God. Seraphim was noted for his joyous life. It showed itself in every line of his face. When people came to visit him he called them his 'joys' and always addressed them with the greeting "Christ is risen!" This is only used in Easter week but with him life was always filled with the joy of the risen Savior and always therefore a glorious Easter holiday. He was possessed with special power in prayer. People who prayed with him said they saw him almost lifted from the earth by the flaming spirit of his petitions, and his close communion with God Himself. His remarkable purity and the freedom from all earthly things made him, like the holy Sergius, a special favorite of the Mother of God. She appeared to him not once, but many times. The vision was seen by many of his disciples and other monks who were in the place. Unlike others of whom we have spoken, this saint was of comparatively recent times. His death occurred in 1830, in the reign of Nicholas I".

"How clearly mediaeval!" the Western critic of the Eastern Church may exclaim, and not without good cause. In the extensive Russian literature comprising the lives of the saints, one finds every phase of mediaeval coloring, continued down to the present time. Saints have seen visions of the Virgin and of other saints: miracles have been wrought: all kinds of temptation and hardships have been endured, oftentimes with the assistance of supernatural power:

the bodies of saintly men have been discovered, uncorrupted after centuries of rest beneath the ground. People in Moskow throng up to kiss the forehead of a sainted Patriarch and the holy remains are held in mysterious reverence. Superficially, it is all as primitive and superstitious, as truly mediaeval as any of the Western critics of the Orthodox Church assert. But beneath this reverence for the person of a saint, the real motive is a sincere respect for the holy life which the name calls to mind. It is a consecrated life that was lived, more than the marvels wrought, which Russian Christianity values so highly. The roads are filled with "Seekers after God" as religious pilgrims are called. Is it strange that they show real respect at the shrine of a personage in whose life they detect some spark of the divine which burns with a more than common lustre?

Of course this cannot give to one of the West any adequate idea of the religious significance of the lives of the saints, in Russia. To comprehend it, one must think himself into the distinctively Eastern atmosphere which has always surrounded Russian religious thought and realize the high value always placed upon holy living and genuine abandonment of devotion. When, after long years of contact with some venerable man whose life may be called saintly, that life is closed, here on earth, it is but natural that the simple minds of an uncultured folk should not conceive of death as ending all the activities of the holy character. When simple folk have such a belief in the continued existence of the "Favorites of God" as the Russian phrase has it, it is quite natural to ask the assistance of their prayers.

The better to hold these holy persons in remembrance, the Eastern Christian has made pictures of them to decorate the house of God. Great and small, old and new, in brilliant gold or sombre color, their presentments adorn every possible part of the church building, a

clear reminder of the "Cloud of Witnesses" the Apostle wrote about.

One sees these pictures of saints, "ikons", everywhere in Russia — not merely in the church and upon its doors and outer walls. These pictures painted upon wood or metal and called ikons, are in every Orthodox home. It is considered that there should be at least one in every room, and old families will often have an ikon corner, where the favorite holy pictures of generations are kept, and toward which the whole family turns as grace is said before a meal, or the prayer upon departing for a journey. In some parts of Russia, servants would not work in homes, Orthodox or not, unless there was an ikon in the servants' part of the house, and hence in Russia one occasionally found the lamp burning before a holy picture in the dwelling of a foreigner who might be a Presbyterian or a Baptist or "not much of anything". Beside the church and the home, ikons were found in every store or other place of business or public assembly. A friend of mine who is a Protestant minister in America said the only time he was tempted in Russia to take something which did not belong to him, was when he came upon the holy picture which had graced the bar of the most luxurious café chantant in Odessa. Then one finds ikons on the street in little shrines set up for the pious remembrance of some special providence. The octagonal booth across from the Europe Hotel in Petrograd was placed there to mark the scene of a great fire in which a number of people perished, and through all the daylight hours there was a never ceasing stream of those who did reverence to the holy pictures it housed. The countryside, as well, has its ikons, and it is a poor village indeed, where, even though it cannot boast a church, there are not a few little cross-capped shrines, with the picture of a saint or two, to remind passersby of the holy lives Russia has held in reverence through thirty generations.

An ikon is a picture, painted on wood or metal, representing some holy person or event. In these modern times, such pictures are even printed, but those made by hand are considered more satisfactory. In literal observance of the first phrase of the Second Commandment, the Eastern Church has rigidly excluded from such representation sculpture in any of its forms, and while in some great churches one finds carved work used for decorative purposes it is always in such a place that it may not be confused with the authorized pictures. There is doubtless good psychological basis for this distinction between painting and sculpture. The great cry raised by the early iconoclasts was that the common folk were led astray by statues, mistaking the image for the original. To this allegation the Greek Church replied by banishing sculpture but permitting the use of pictures, which even the most untutored mind never would mistake for the persons they represented.

People craved sculpture, however, and so there developed the curious custom of covering all except the hands and face and feet of the picture with a metal "riza" or "sacred dress", embossed to represent the folds of clothing indicated in the painting. These coverings are usually of silver or gold, and in fine houses or churches are often set with valuable jewels. The huge emerald in the crown represented over the brow of the Vladimir Madonna in the Assumption Cathedral was valued at $50,000. and the other jewels studding the same picture, at ten times that sum. When, as in the case of this picture of the Virgin, the painting happens to be a very old one, with all the smoke of incense of a score of generations to cloud its surface, an ikon presents a curious appearance. To the casual observer it seems to be a gorgeously jewelled portrait in metal relief with black holes of suitable shape indicating the position of hands and face.

These old paintings are always the most highly prized, their very antiquity seeming to give them increased value. The Vladimir Virgin, just mentioned, is reputed to have been the work of Saint Luke, although generally claimed to be only a copy of an original by the Evangelist. Whatever its origin, it is known to have been in existence as early as the third century, and every step of its history since that time is accounted for. If a genuinely old ikon is not available, it is much better to have a copy of an old one, rather than a picture new both in design and workmanship, and the canons of ancient iconography have been rigidly followed through all the history of the Russian Church. There are several different schools of ikon painting, differing in minor details, that of Novgorod, for instance, insisting upon the use of a yellow or gold background, while another school regarded it as essential that flesh should be represented with a decidedly greenish tone. One of the incidental contributions of the Orthodox Church to world culture is that she has thus preserved to us the styles of bygone centuries of artists. In her churches we have the finest examples of early Byzantine paintings which are left in all the world.

You stand in any church or shrine and see dozens of people doing reverence before the holy pictures, placing candles to burn before them, or crowding in long lines on special feast days to salute them with a kiss, and you wonder what it all means. Even if you overcome your Western notions of hygiene, and carefully scrubbing off the glass over a wonder-working picture with a towel which is placed there for that purpose, press your lips to the same spot where hundreds of others before you have saluted the saint, still you of the materialistic West probably feel no religious emotion or any heightened sense of worship. Ask a Russian what purpose the holy picture serves, and he will probably answer in somewhat the same words

as those of a Russian priest I once interrogated upon the subject.

He had been speaking about the Russian's reverence for the holy men of the past, and continuing, he said :"It is easily comprehensible, therefore, how the Russian thinks of his advocates in heaven, the great protectors of those who suffer or are in need. On this account the Russians have always paid special reverence to the ikons of the Mother of God and of the Saints. The Russian is that sort of a person — he does not like things indefinite and intangible; he appreciates the picture, the representation before him in beautiful aspect, of those persons whom he counts so valuable an aid in his religious life. So we have pictures in our houses and in our churches in constant remembrance of those whose lives are our inspiration, and whose prayers to God assist us".

Theoretically, the use of ikons still follows the rules confirmed in the second Council of Nicea, 787, where their presence in churches is authorized and reverence paid to them is sanctioned, with a most careful distinction between the reverence paid to images ("douleia") and real worship ("latreia"), which is due to God, alone. The Orthodox Church has always scrupulously taught that the holy pictures are not to be worshipped for themselves. Yet there actually is, and always has been, a curious combination of the theoretical knowledge that these figures were but painted wood coupled with a deep-seated awe before the things themselves. It is something no Russian has satisfactorily explained. A peasant in the church will solemnly kiss a picture which he would pass without a glance if he saw it elsewhere, in a shop window for example. The ikons come to have intrinsic worth, in themselves, and for some historic figure of the Virgin such as that of Kazan, which has accompanied the Russian armies on battlefields of great victories like Moskow and Borodino, and for whose proper housing

the second largest cathedral in Petrograd was built, a veneration is expressed which is clearly more than pure spiritual devotion to the holy Original. To a degree the thing receives the same honor as the person represented, and there are times during great church processions when a man must remove his hat as the sacred pictures pass or have it forcibly removed for him. One may argue that this tendency to reverence the thing in place of the idea represented is inherent in every people, East and West; that in America we have our Liberty Bell, which is almost reverenced and a Flag so sacred that it must never touch the ground, and he who dares refuse it honor must pay for the indiscretion with a battered head. This is true, of course, yet perhaps there is a slightly different situation in the reverence paid to ikons. We do not address prayers to our flag; it must be admitted that sometimes the untutored peasant does offer petitions to some black and venerable image of a saint or of the Savior.

For it is not beauty which makes men pay reverence to a particular ikon. On the contrary, some of those considered most holy are so old and darkened by the years that one traces with the utmost difficulty even the outlines of the features. And even if the image be well preserved, it is a true descendant of the Byzantine original whence its first copy was made six or eight or sixteen centuries ago: stiff and emaciated saints in postures as ascetic as the hermits of Nitria, pallid faces set out against gleaming haloes of gold above the austere garb of monk or cleric: In these there is little of appeal to the sense of beauty. The worshipper certainly is not lured into thinking he salutes the angelic personages, themselves.

Then where is the charm? What inspires the worship, or somewhat approaching it, which an Orthodox believer bestows upon his ikons? Go to a church as new and unhallowed by tradition as the Cathedral

in Odessa: watch the long line of people waiting their turn to kiss the wonder-working picture of the Virgin. A peasant, a lady in a sable coat, a General in uniform and a school girl with the family cook; two students who cross themselves reverently as they approach the moment of salutation, and still more fervently as they turn from the picture; and you will believe what a charming Russian lady of my acquaintance once told me. She is a University graduate who has travelled considerably in other countries, and so I felt as though I might ask her why people paid such respect to their ikons. "I cannot tell you", she said, "I often ask myself. I do not need to assure you that there is no confusion in my mind between the Blessed Mother of God and an ugly painting of her in our chapel. I do not believe with my head that I can worship God thus, nor gain for myself any credit by saluting an ikon. Yet my heart knows some benefit it receives when I kneel before a picture in the church, and I tell you it is true, though my mind cannot explain it."

Ikons are not always fixed in one place. The visitation of the Iverian Madonna to those who are sick, is an example of this. Or take a picture from the marketplace in a Volga river town. Amidst the miscellaneous jumble of wares and merchants, Tatar women and second hand stores, pancake sellers and Chinese peddlers, their backs bent under cloth-wrapped bales of silk, here comes a pair of real Russians. Two peasants with frowsy hair and shapeless hats in hand, each dressed in a sheepskin coat and bark shoes with the thongs wound up about his leg-cloths, come through the crowd, carrying between them a huge old ikon. And this is what they call out as they pass along: "Kind-hearted Russian Orthodox Christians, give something to the support of the holy temple. It will be for the salvation of your souls and the good of all God's people, and Christ will bless you". And in spite of their uncouth dress and their evident village origin,

there is so much earnestness about them that they walk as dignifiedly as the greatest in the land. As they pass, the crowd bow reverently to the ikon, cross themselves, and usually drop a bit of money into the tin box hung about the neck of one of the men. We do not know what church they are collecting for. Probably it is in some out-of-the-way village a hundred miles from here, but we put our contribution into the tin box, with not the least doubt in the world that it will reach its avowed destination.

Or stand before one of the great churches in Kiev or in the Trinity Monastery outside Moskow, and you will see the pilgrims come. Here is one, a bent gray-headed man, with his birch-wood staff and a little canvas bag on his shoulder which contains, it may be, all his earthly possessions. The bag slips to the floor, and leaning on his staff the "seeker after God" gets painfully to his knees beside it. The church may be crowded with folk in holiday attire, a vivid contrast to the weatherbeaten tatters of this peasant, but he is as singly intent upon his devotions as though he were the only worshipper in all the temple. Talk with him as he comes out of the church, mumbling a "Thank you, God", for having been permitted to visit one more holy spot, and you may discover that he has come on foot from some province a thousand miles away. He has visited "Our Holy Mother Moskow", and now wishes to get to Kiev or perhaps Mount Athos, before he dies.

These pilgrimages are a very characteristic part of Russian religion. Scarcely a peasant lives who has not at some time dreamed of making a journey to the tomb of St. Sergius, or to the Solovetsky Monastery, in the White Sea. Distance is no bar, and oftentimes a peasant who has waited all his life for leisure to make the journey, in his old age, sets his affairs in order, and starts out with staff in hand on a long tramp to some far distant holy place. Kiev, Mount Athos and

the Holy Land were crowded every summer. More pilgrims came to Jerusalem every year from Russia, than from all other lands, together. Read Tolstoi's "Two old Men", or Stephen Graham's most sympathetic "With Russian Pilgrims to Jerusalem", and try to understand the devotion which leads these searchers after God, on foot across half the world.

Most monasteries and other resorts of pilgrims have special provisions for their entertainment. The Sergievskaya Lavra, for example, has a hostel where one may lodge without cost while on a visit to its score of shrines. The Solovetsky Monastery usually takes its guests into the regular regimen of the place, assigning them tasks together with the rest of the community, and it is no unusual thing for a pilgrim to stay in that service two years instead of the two weeks he originally meant to spend on the holy island. The Imperial Government erected an enormous monastery-hostel just outside the gates of Jerusalem, to care for the throngs of its subjects who came there every year. The little Orthodox churchyards scattered about Palestine are full of the graves of those pilgrims whose journey ended with the Holy Land.

To many Protestants these descriptions of the practices of the Orthodox Church may seem, in so far as they are very ancient, to be indistinguishable from those of the Church of Rome. But although we find much of the mediaeval simplicity and, may it be said with all due respect, much of the superstition which marks the religious life of Catholic countries, still a more thorough examination will disclose many points in which Orthodoxy approaches Protestantism, rather than Roman Catholicism.

A married priesthood removes the double standard of Christian living so completely from Russian thought that the retention of a monastic system does not militate against popular ideas of the accessibility of a truly religious life for all. The support of the regular

clergy in the Orthodox Church is more like that of Protestantism than of Rome. The Orthodox "Little Father", as has been noted in a previous chapter, must often gain his living by working in the fields side by side with his people. His whole round of existence is much more closely cognate with that of his flock than is the case in a Catholic parish.

The wide distribution of the Scriptures among all the people is another feature which characterizes Russian Orthodoxy. And not merely a wide distribution, but an intimate knowledge, especially of the Gospels. One finds this in Russians of every degree of culture. Half the proverbs of the common people are couched in Biblical language, and although you do not find the whole Bible so widely used as in some Protestant lands, the Gospels are known everywhere. One finds it in the hands of workmen and peasants, and the university student seeking new paths for his developing thought, pores over the Gospels as the ultimate source of truth. As Leroy-Beaulieu says, "All that the people have in the way of religious or moral training they get there. The influence of the Book upon the Russian soul is not to be denied; in spite of ignorance and superstitions, the faith of the people deserves the name "Evangelical" if to be that it is enough to be nourished upon the very marrow of the Gospel".

One other factor distinguishes Orthodoxy from Roman Catholicism: the democratic structure of its Church government. From earliest times, when the Councils were regarded as the supreme authority in ecclesiastical affairs, the Orthodox Church has always held that the ultimate constituent of the church is the body of believers, lay as well as clergy. To be sure, Russia now has a Patriarch but he is not a Pope. He has no power to alter the dogma of the Church. He is chosen by an election in which all classes of the people participate, and he has no more spiritual authority than

any other Bishop of the whole Orthodox Church. The forms of popular expression by way of a Council which now obtain in the Russian Church will be more fully outlined in the Chapter on the Church since the Revolution. In general, the Church's democratic tendencies are indicated in the universal custom of using the language of the people. One of the early disputes between East and West arose from the fact that Cyril and Methodius employed the language of the Moravians for the Liturgy in their country, instead of the Latin authorized by Rome. Wherever you find the Orthodox Church today, you will hear its service in the language of the people to whom it is ministering: Japanese in Japan, the Aleutian language in Alaska, and often in American churches parts of the Liturgy are pronounced in English, from the beautiful translation of the Service Book by Miss Hapgood, authorized and first published by the Holy Synod. When a Russian wishes to state that a person is pleasant to know, and in general agreement with his own thought, he uses the untranslatable word "sympateechnie"; to members of Protestant communions, the Orthodox Church is in many respects more "sympateechnie" than any other of the grand divisions of Christendom.

Not without profit to ourselves, may we of the Protestant West study the Orthodox Church, for there are many characteristics in which we may learn from the older body. Take for instance the devotional side of religion: When you visit an Orthodox Church, the service may be sung in a language you do not understand, yet your heart is lifted up in the true worship of the congregation, you sense the nearness of God and the beauty of His praise. In our zeal to do things for our Master, we of the Western world sometimes forget the need of sitting at His feet in devotion. It is this side of religion which the Orthodox Church has preserved for us in a way unequalled

in history. We may object that to spend so many hours in contemplation, leaves no time for work, yet while the Russian Church perhaps might profit by a larger emphasis upon doing, she has much to teach us, of the need and beauty of devotion. Read the rich devotional literature of Russia, or talk with the simplest peasant, and you will be astonished at the intimate idea of God you find revealed in brief glimpses into the real heart of religion. If we of the Protestant world can pause a while in our hurry to be of service to God through serving his children, we may learn from the Christianity of Russia new lessons in the devotional side of our faith.

Then there is the ideal of holiness: the deep respect for holy lives, past and present. which characterizes Russian Christianity in an extraordinary degree. "This people", says Leroy-Beaulieu, "is one of the very few who have treasured and kept alive this notion of holiness, — so lofty, so unfamiliar to Western crowds, sublime and strange to us. The Russian peasant is almost alone in Europe in seeking for the pearl of great price, and looking with veneration on the hands that seem to have found it". Or, as a Russian priest explained just recently, "Other lands revere the richest, the greatest, the strongest; Russia reveres the holiest. Riches — are trifles; the most noted today, is forgotten tomorrow; but holiness—lasts forever". To the materialism of the modern West which threattens at times to crowd out the spiritual even from religion, the study of that which in Russian minds lies back of this devotion to holy living, can not be altogether profitless.

Out of this ideal of holiness there grows another, equally characteristic of Russian Christianity. No matter how wide his contacts with Russian folk, the foreign visitor never ceases to be amazed at the humility which they exhibit. Nowhere will you find a people more conscious of their own weakness and insufficiency;

nowhere a more sincere respect for the virtue in other peoples and races, or a more eager desire to learn whatever of good they may have to impart. When one Russian bids another farewell he says "Prostachaite", "forgive", indicative of his wish for pardon of any unconscious offense he may have given. This quality, to be sure, may be carried to extremes, and it is to be hoped that one of the lessons Russian folk will learn from the past five years of tumult, will be a firmer confidence in their own ability to do things. Nevertheless, we hope they may never lose their beautiful desire to discover and learn the good in others.

Besides these things, one can but admire the Russian Church's firm retention of the faith as she first received it. Much may be said in criticism of this policy of guarding a changeless faith, as for example, the remarks of a noted Catholic writer: "Embodied in an infallible Pope, the Roman Church can speak, move, bind or loose; while the Eastern Church is like her own rigid ikons: her lips like theirs, are closed; her limbs, stiff with the immovability of centuries, cannot bend at will — they have lost their power". All of which is a very pretty simile, but it does not comprehend the whole truth. What Russia received from the Eastern Church, she was told, was the Truth, embraced in the Scriptures and the Canons of the Seven Councils, and for a thousand years she has guarded those early doctrines as fundamental and unchangeable. The growing movement in the West, urging a return to the earlier forms of Christianity should be especially grateful to the Russian Church for her long task of guarding these truths, for with true Slavic fidelity the Orthodox Church has kept them, unaltered. On the other hand, this has not at all impeded the church's development to meet changing needs. Her dogmas may not have changed: it is conceivable that the world could still go on, had such new doctrines as the Immaculate Conception or

Papal Infallibility never been introduced. But the forms of expression of unalterable truth have changed and are changing, as new conditions require. How capable are the "stiff limbs" of this ancient church to step out into new forms of activity, may best be illustrated by the last chapter of this book which outlines the effective way in which the Russian Church is meeting the tremendous problems involved in the outbursting new needs of her people.

In one other phase of religious experience the Russian Church without doubt excels all others. Whatever the effect of other parts of the Orthodox form of worship upon him, it is impossible for a Western Christian to listen unmoved and uninspired to the music which forms so important a part of the service. If there is more devotional song on earth than that of the great services of the Russian Church, the writer has yet to hear it. Even a French Catholic, Leroy-Beaulieu, grows enthusiastic about it: "Just as, in the matter of plastic arts, the Orthodox Church tolerates only the least material, painting, so in the matter of sacred music, she will have none but the most spiritual, the most allied to prayer — singing. No soulless instruments, wood or brass, to praise God — only the one living instrument, the human voice, given by the Lord to sing His praises in all eternity. No harp or psalterion, as in Hebrew Temples; no viola or bassoon, such as Fra Angelico and Perugino placed in the hands of their angels; no thousand-toned organ, no many-colored orchestra; nothing to support the singing of the choir or congregation; the choirs of men on earth, as those of the angels in heaven, must find their law in themselves".

No words can give an adequate description of the unique and wonderful worship the Russian Church has developed in its song. All the shades of meaning of which the human voice is capable have been used with marvelous effect. Go to the church and listen to

the wonder of Bortniansky's setting of the Cherubimic Hymn: sense the majestic beauty of the Creed as it is chanted by choir and people together, with its glorious final emphasis on the Resurrection and the Life: lift your heart in a new beauty of devotion as the music "In Thy Kingdom" floats heavenward like the incense which typifies prayer, and ask if Russian Christianity has not much of value to us of the hurrying, sermonizing West.

In connection with this consideration of what the Christianity of Russia has to teach the West, would it be altogether presumptuous to suggest one or two western phases of the expression of our common faith as worthy the Russian Church's attention, as it goes about its task of reorganization to face the new needs of one hundred million people? If Protestant Christianity could profitably put a larger emphasis upon the purely devotional side of religion, perhaps our over-emphasized activity might be worth some attention by the East. The ethical side of being a Christian might perhaps receive greater emphasis in Russia than it has ever had before. When once the Russian grasps a conception of Christianity as something to be lived in every one of the twenty-four hours of the day, as well as something deeply stirring to his emotional nature, and then combines those two things into workable form, the world will have an expression of the Christian faith which comes nearer to the ideal than anything we know, today.

With this in mind, perhaps a new emphasis upon the study of the Bible is another step which Russian Christianity could take in its reorganization, using the gospel not simply in a devotional or inspirational sense, but as a source of method for making Christian every phase of daily life, social as well as personal. This involves some of the more modern methods of study and interpretation; the historical as well as the mystical Christ. Russian folk have ca-

pacities for idealism and self sacrifice which are rarely surpassed, anywhere, and with the conception once launched of Scripture study for the purpose of making religion a workaday affair, the Western world may find its borrowed ideals returning across the seas with newer and richer interpretations then ever it has visioned.

All this will necessarily involve an advance from the old educational ideals of Russia, religious and civil alike. Mindful of the fact that it held the leadership of popular culture through eight centuries, the Russian Church may well resume her task, now, perhaps seeking from the experience of other countries suggestions as to its future policy. If it can send forth from its seminaries and other schools, within the present decade, a new type of clergy, retaining all the good of the old order and still alive with broader ideals and a higher cultural standard, the Church will again occupy its proper place as guiding the nation's moral and religious life. The Christianity of the West has at least to offer to that of Russia an ideal of religion in which work and worship are equally important, where religion is considered specifically in the light of the needs and aims of the modern man. If religion consists solely in beautiful worship, adherence to ancient belief and custom, reverence for holiness in every age, and a sincere desire to spread the name of Jesus Christ, Protestants have nothing to teach Russia: but if it means, beside all this, a growing activity in the service of mankind, a keen appreciation of the needs of modern life, and a desire to educate its youth to minister to the needy of the future, perhaps Protestantism has its message for Russian Christianity.

Whatever has here been said can do no more than suggest a more intensive study of many of the phases of Russian theory and practice in Christianity. Perhaps it has served to indicate one thing: beneath all the formal differences, such as seven sacraments

instead of two or a special reverence for holy persons and places and their representation in pictures; or even the larger emphasis upon devotion instead of doing as the prime essential in Christian living; beneath all these seeming differences is it not clear that we have one and the same faith whatever be its outward form of expression? Are not the great things we have in common, our Scripture, our knowledge of God and of His Son, our reverence for His service, so vastly more important than any of the trifles which divide us that we should forget the differences in striving for a better understanding, each of the other? Once such a mutual appreciation of worthfulness is achieved, and a sense of our essential brotherhood, perhaps the time can come when without consciously seeking organic union, the Russian Church and the Christian bodies of the West, all intent upon the task of making God's world a better place for His children to live in, will suddenly lift their eyes to find themselves one, joined in the bond of a common service.

CHAPTER XI.

SINCE THE REVOLUTION.

When the Revolution broke over Russia in the spring of 1917 and the collapse of the Tsar's Regime threw the country suddenly into a state of unrest and change, of all institutions connected with the old order, the Church was possibly the least to be immediately affected. Prayers for the Provisional Government were introduced into the Liturgy to replace those for members of the Imperial Family which had been recited daily for three hundred years. Sermons began to be more frequently heard and more vital in content. These were almost the only alterations at once discernible. The Holy Synod continued to function and even its lay "Oberprokuror", remained in office. The country was so busy adjusting itself to multifarious new emergencies more urgent than Church reform that striking events in Church history for the early months of 1917 are few. The idea of separating Church and State was mentioned occasionally by publicists or liberals of one sort or another, and the small group which had long advocated the restoration of a Patriarchate now came into the open and made themselves heard. But these voices had small influence, and in general it may be said that Church affairs flowed quite smoothly along old channels up to the beginning of the Kerensky regime in July.

The early weeks of the Kerensky Government brought small alteration in church matters. The Church continued to receive its former financial support from the Government. A special grant of one million roubles was made to cover the expenses of the

General Church Council, which met in Moskow in August, Kerensky remarking as he signed the check that the church leaders were foolish for having asked so little when they might have had a larger sum. The Church received further recognition from the Government in an invitation to send its official representatives to the All-Russian Congress in Moskow. Three delegates were appointed and attended the Congress. The attitude of the Church at this period is quite clearly indicated by the fact that although thus early in the Revolution there were patent indications of an eventual alteration in the relationships between Church and State, the principal contribution of these delegates to the activities of the Congress was a resolution urging the official recognition of the Deity in the proposed constitution.

The first striking change from the old relationships between Church and State was the abolition of the office of Oberprokuror of the Holy Synod and the inclusion in his place in the Cabinet of a "Minister of Confessions" whose duties consisted in caring for the interests of all religious faiths, with no privileges shown to the Orthodox Church. This change was sharply resented, but created perhaps less stir than the various reforms introduced by the Ministry of Education.

Under the old regime, a compulsory feature of education in all institutions, for all classes of people from newly-recruited soldiers to high-school pupils and naval cadets, was the "Law of God", really a thorough instruction in the Orthodox Catechism, with a set course of study approved by the Church and almost invariably taught by a priest. It was considered as inevitable as orthography or grammar, and the decree of Kerensky's Minister of Education by which it was removed from the list of required subjects brought a severe shock not only to the Church leaders but to the general public. The decree did not prohibit religious teaching in schools, it merely made

such education optional instead of obligatory. Against this the Church protested vigorously, although without result.

Shortly after the appearance of this decree, a still more sweeping alteration in the old order was made by the inclusion of all schools in Russia under one Government system, and the consequent order to close all parochial schools and turn their equipment over to the State. Against this action the Church exerted all its efforts. It might even reconcile itself to the abolition of religious teaching in public schools, but it demanded the right to maintain its own schools where religion could be taught. Many were even willing to renounce any claim to State support for these schools if only they need not be closed. Again the Church's solemn protests were unavailing. Events were rapidly moving toward a complete separation of Church and State.

Early in November (1917) the Communist coup put Lenin and the Bolshevist Government into power. In January a decree appeared declaring Church and State separate and ordering the cessation of all State financial support on February first. Other decrees followed swiftly. One ordered the elimination of all religious instruction in the schools, thus ruling out the "Law of God" which the Kerensky Government had merely made optional. Another decree nationalized all church buildings and property and ordered their formal surrender to the State. Still another denied the Church any legal rights as a party in a process at law. By the spring of 1918 a very definite movement was evident to oppress the Church and its officers. Priests were arrested; church buildings seized and transformed into schools or restaurants. Such needless insults were offered the Orthodox as the violation of some of their most sacred shrines with moving pictures taken during the act of desecration. Admission was denied to the Kremlin churches. An attempt was under

way to crowd the Church out of existence. The movement ceased almost as suddenly as it began. Of course there was never an official explanation of this period of persecution or of its close, but those in Russia at the time clearly saw that in this direction the Soviet government felt it dare go no further: the Russian folk would stand much in the way of innovation or even oppression, but it never would permit forcible hands to be laid upon its Church. Many touching scenes of popular defence of the Church drove the lesson home, and the period of general inhibition against organized religion passed. When it is recalled how intimately the Church was bound up with the monarchy and all that pertained to the "ancien regime", it is not surprising that it should be deeply distrusted by radical elements in any revolutionary government, and whatever moves have been made against the Church are clearly explicable on this ground alone. Deservedly or no, the Church has been paying the penalty for having been so closely connected with the Tsarist system. The years 1919—1921 witnessed very little change in attitude between the Church and the Soviet government. If one dared apply the phrase to so peaceful a body as the Orthodox Church it might be said that the situation for those years was one of armed peace. The new outbreak of persecution beginning with the early months of 1922, promises to be more severe than that of 1918, but it can have no different results. As a letter just received from Moskow says: "Two things are certain about our Church; first, it will change to meet new conditions; second, it will persist through any trial".

The foregoing paragraphs have recounted some of the effects produced upon the Church by outside agencies: far more important is the study of the movement within the Church itself to meet a series of ever-changing emergencies. The Church in France was sustained throughout the stress of the revolutionary

period there by the fact that the great mass of its organization was outside the storm-area. It had a Pope in Rome and all his powerful institutions in other countries to help it regain its poise once the gale had passed. Not so the Church of Russia. In all the past five years of uncertainty and disorder it has had no one to look to for guidance or aid save itself. What the Orthodox Church has done in those years, it alone deserves credit for. If ever an institution has been put to the test, it is the Russian Church of the past few years and the results of these trials seem to augur well for the future. No better answer could have been devised to Leroy-Beaulieu's charge that the Orthodox Church was so stiffened by centuries of immobility as to be incapable of adapting itself to the changing needs of its people.

Practically the sum-total of the Church's official activity during these years is comprised in the assembly of the General Council ("Sobor") and the decrees which it passed. Long before the revolution the desire for a general council had been more or less frequently expressed but under the Synod system even a gathering of bishops was impossible. Soon after the revolution however, public opinion began to crystallize about the desire for a council to assist in adjusting the Church to the situation, and finally the Synod, under the guidance of Prince V. N. Lvoff issued the call for a general council to be assembled in Moskow in August. The date of its convocation is epochal. For two hundred years Russia had not witnessed a General Council. Thus it was an extraordinary event in itself, but in its composition it was absolutely unique. All previous Church councils, not only of Russia but of the entire Eastern Church, had been made up exclusively of the clergy, chiefly bishops. In the new Russian Council the laity were not only admitted on equal terms with the clergy, but lay delegates actually outnumbered the clerical. Of a total of 564 delegates,

299 were laymen, 185 were of the lower clergy and only 80 were bishops. No body more completely representative of all Russia was ever assembled. There were six delegates from each of Russia's 66 dioceses, four from each of the four great theological academies, one from each university, and a group of about ten representing all the monasteries in Russia. The delegation from each diocese consisted of the Bishop, two other members of some order of the clergy, and three laymen. Each diocese held a diocesan council for the election of its delegates, so that a more truly representative system could scarcely be imagined.

The diocesan councils were oftentimes very warm affairs. The story of such a gathering in Tomsk, Siberia, may throw some light upon the turbulent times in which this whole readjustment of Church affairs had to be carried out. Although the revolution itself passed with a minimum of bloodshed and disorder, still the weeks and months following it saw an increasing instability in all phases of civic life. Soldiers' and workmen's councils were striving with other self-ordained governmental bodies for supreme control and no one could be at all sure when he went to bed, whom he would find governing his city next morning. Tomsk was temporarily under a compromise government consisting of a committee of safety working in rather indefinite relationships with a soldiers' council. The diocesan convention assembled, and duly elected its delegates to Moskow. But there were many other matters of domestic business to be attended to, and here some malcontents tried to stampede the meeting. Two priests whose conduct had at one time made it necessary for the Bishop to discipline them, now attempted to force a resolution deposing him. The resolution was voted down by a large majority. The insurgents left the hall, returning with armed guards from the soldiers' council, ever ready

to interfere with anything which could be represented to them as of the old order. Guards were stationed at all exits and the insurgents announced that no one would be permitted to leave the hall until the resolution dethroning Bishop Anatolii had been passed. One after another, the various members of the "Presidium" resigned, rather than put such a motion, and at last a soldier was put into the president's chair, all the other guards joining in the affirmative vote on the resolution. It was announced that the Bishop must resign and the council was declared adjourned. As a matter of fact Bishop Anatolii did not resign, but attended the Moskow "Sobor" and still remains in his office, one of the best-loved pastors in the Russian Church. Not all the local councils in Russia at this time were as tumultuous as in Tomsk, but the incident is truly typical of the uncertain and disordered atmosphere in which the Church had to set about its task of reorganization.

When the Holy General Council ("Sobor"*) of the Russian Orthodox Church assembled in Moskow on August 15th, 1917 it represented all classes of the people, from all corners of Russia.

The Sobor began its constructive work amid circumstances of wide-spread disorganization and disorder, in the midst of unheard-of national catastrophe, both external and internal. The power which had fallen from the Emperor's hands was seized upon by the partisans of all sorts of doctrines, each vainly trying to reconstruct a new social order, some even willing to risk the complete humiliation and disorganization of their country in order to carry out their

---

* Note: the Russian word "Sobor" is employed in speaking of great church assemblies like the seven Ecumenical Councils. To distinguish this important gathering from the Supreme Church Council, a subsidiary organization, the Russian word will be used in the following pages.

schemes. With the growth of this disorder, and the progressively unfriendly attitude of successive governments, the task of the Sobor widened and deepened.

In the first place, a new system of church government had to be created. The monarchy and all its appendages was gone for ever, and the Church had to devise an independent form of direction for its affairs, embracing not only ecclesiastical administration, but an entirely new system of material support as well. The huge subsidies from the Tsar's treasuries, sometimes amounting to nearly fifty million dollars annually, would no longer be available. The Church must become self-supporting, and some scheme to attain this end was one of the first tasks of the Sobor.

But the changes necessary in the external forms of the Church's administration, sweeping as they were, were less important than the requirements of new religious demands. The last decades of the old regime had witnessed a lowered morale throughout the Orthodox Church, an alarming lassitude which was reflected in a correspondingly lessened interest and respect on the part of the Russian people. Under the old regime a call for change in the established order was revolutionary and likely to be met by exile to Siberia or to some disciplinary monastery for the presumptuous cleric who offered it. Now the fetters were broken, and facing the new day, the Church set itself to work out the reform in its inner life which would best fit it to minister to a free, progressive people. How both these tasks of administrative reconstruction and spiritual reform were carried out, may best be indicated by a brief sketch of the ordinances passed by the Sobor.

First, in the matter of Church government. From the very outset two tendencies had made themselves felt in proposals for the new forms of Church administration. There was the party advocating strict retension of the old theories of a ruling hierarchy, modelled

after the historic patriarchal system which had obtained in Russia up to the time of Peter the Great. Another group demanded the utmost possible democracy in the management of Church affairs. The system adopted is a skilful compromise between the two, safeguarding as far as possible the influence of the clergy, but placing final authority in a General Council (Sobor), constituted and elected similarly to the first one and embodying a majority of laymen. The Sobor is to assemble once every three years and will deliberate upon all questions of major importance in ecclesiastical practice and doctrine. We quote the first paragraph of the book containing the decisions of the Sobor: "I. In the Orthodox Church of Russia the supreme power, legislative, administrative, judicial and supervisory belongs to a national Sobor, assembled periodically at fixed intervals and consisting of bishops, lower clergy and laymen. II. The Patriarchate is restored and ecclesiastical administration is supervised by a Patriarch. III. The Patriarch is considered first among equal bishops. IV. The Patriarch, together with the other organs of Church administration is responsible to the Sobor".

The position and authority of the "Most Holy Patriarch of Moskow and all Russia" is very carefully defined. He is the executive head of the Church but by no means an autocrat. He is entrusted with "care for the internal and external well-being of the Church" and with power to represent it in dealing with civil authorities. The Patriarch issues the call for the triennial Sobor and presides at its sessions, as well as at the meetings of the two legislative bodies assembling in the interim between the Sobors. As president of both these bodies, the Patriarch has the right to protest against any decision he considers inimical to the well-being of the Church, this protest practically amounting to a veto, since it causes the suspension of the disputed action until passed upon by the next

Sobor. The Patriarch may even take what he deems the correct action, himself, in opposition to the decisions of these legislative bodies, but he must report his reasons to the next Sobor. The Patriarch conducts relations with other autocephalic churches. He confirms the appointment to diocesan cathedra of bishops elected by diocesan assemblies. In emergencies or for special reasons affecting the welfare of the Church, he may himself appoint men to fill the office of Archbishop. He has authority to advise and counsel other bishops and to report to the Sobor any inattention to his admonitions. Although he is elected for life, he may be impeached by the Sobor acting in conjunction with such other of the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church as are able to attend the trial. In brief, he is the executive head of a church governed by elective councils, to which alone he is responsible.

Conjointly with the Patriarch two elective bodies manage the affairs of the Orthodox Church in the intervals between Sobors. They are known as the Holy Synod and the Supreme Church Council. The Holy Synod consists of the Patriarch, who presides, and twelve bishops, six chosen by the Sobor and five others, one from each of the five districts into which all Russia is divided for purposes of church government. These divisions are known as Northwest, Southwest, Central, Eastern and Siberian, in which, by the way, is included the diocese of North America. In accordance with ancient church usage the Metropolitan of Kiev is made a permanent member of the Holy Synod. To be eligible for election to the Holy Synod a bishop must have occupied a given episcopal seat for more than two years. In defining its field of activity the published statutes of the Sobor state: "The function of the Holy Synod is hierarchical and pastoral in character, relating chiefly to the internal life of the Church". Among others, the following items are noted as belonging within the

Synod's jurisdiction: doctrine, liturgy, ecclesiastical (theological) education, church direction and discipline. Under doctrine are included mission supervision and the censorship of religious books beside supreme responsibility for the preservation of the dogmas and teaching of the Orthodox Church.

The Supreme Church Council is made up of fifteen members, three bishops chosen by the Holy Synod from among its members, five members of the lower clergy, one monk and six laymen, all elected by the Sobor but not necessarily from among its own delegates, to serve for the three-year period between its sessions. The supreme Council is entrusted with administration and economics, the management of legal matters concerning the Church, as well as the conduct of business organizations, such as the academies, the Synod Press, and the auditing of their financial records.

Besides the activities just outlined for the Synod and the Supreme Church Council severally, there is a long list of matters upon which the joint deliberation of both bodies is required. In general, this joint action gives added weight and authority to their decision. A glance at the rules governing joint sessions as well as separate meetings of both Synod and Council may be interesting. Decisions are made according to the majority vote, with the customary right of suffrage to the president, in case of a tie. All members present must vote and all are required to sign the decisions although a minority may append their report to the minutes of the meeting. Any member of either body may introduce a subject for discussion by presenting the matter in writing to the Patriarch, who is then obliged to lay it before the appropriate council. As has already been stated, the Patriarch has authority to veto any action taken by the Synod or Supreme Council, after once requesting a reconsideration, and his decision may be altered only by the next Sobor, to which he is obliged to present any such matter.

Thus the general government of the Russian Church is a sort of rough parallel to that of the United States of America, with the Patriarch as President, and two houses of congress: the Holy Synod, made up entirely of bishops and the Supreme Council, consisting of both clergy and laymen. The decrees of each have to be confirmed by the Patriarch who is reponsible only to the Sobor. Unlike the houses of congress, the Synod and Council may not pass a resolution over the Patriarch's veto. His decision may be altered only by the Sobor. This body chosen by general election and meeting triennially, is an intermediary between people and governing bodies which does not exist in America. The fact that it is chosen from among all church members and consists of both clergy and laymen with the latter in the majority, is a guarantee of the permanent democracy of the government of the Russian Church.

The system for local government in each diocese corresponds generally to that for the Church. The administrative power is in the hands of a bishop assisted by a diocesan council of five, three of whom must be priests. The local organ corresponding to the Sobor is known as the Diocesan Assembly, meeting periodically, and made up of clerical and lay members in equal numbers. This Assembly is the legislative and deliberative body for the diocese and the bishop is to direct the affairs of his diocese "in cooperation" with it. In a disagreement with the Assembly, the Bishop has the final word, subject to the consideration of the Sobor. Here again, we have an instance of the combination of the two principles of hierarchical and democratic control of Church affairs.

The new rulings of the Sobor regarding the Episcopate must not be overlooked. It is proposed to have a bishop in every large city, thus greatly increasing the number of clergy of episcopal rank. They are appointed by the presiding Archbishop and are con-

firmed by the Patriarch and the Synod. Each bishop is to be consecrated in his own city, instead of jouneying, as formerly, to some great center, usually Petrograd. Sweeping innovations are found in the regulations laid down for the choosing of Archbishops and determining their activities. Instead of being appointed by a far distant Synod, as under the Tsar's regime, and subject to very frequent transfers from one see to another as political or local governmental conditions varied, an Archbishop is now to be elected for life by his own diocese. More revolutionary is the provision that Archbishops may be chosen "from among monastics or from among unmarried 'white' clergy or laymen", provided they have sufficiently high moral and educational qualifications. In the old church government system the custom of choosing bishops exclusively from among the monastic clergy was rigidly observed. This restriction is now removed. Only unmarried men of other ranks are eligible, and a semi-monastic character for the episcopate is insured by the provision that when a priest or layman is elected to the office of Archbishop, if he does not take full monastic orders before his consecration he must at least accept what is known as the "lesser tonsure" of the lay brothers in a cloister. This involves the obligation of residing in a monastery. But even this admission of others than members of the "black" clergy to the candidacy for archepiscopal office is a stride in the direction of a liberalism undreamed-of under the old system.

The democratic tendency is noticeable in the division of every diocese into districts each with its own local assembly consisting of all the clergy of the district and an equal number of laymen chosen by their several congregations. Every church congregation, (what we in America would term the church's membership) has its own assembly for the management of its affairs. Under a system where all churches were sup-

ported by the State, the regular attendance of any member of the Orthodox Church at any given place of worship was a matter of small importance. In fact anything corresponding to the membership lists in our Protestant churches was quite unknown in Russia. Under the new system, however, each Orthodox Christian is supposed to register as a member of some particular congregation, thereby assuming his obligations as a supporting church member. It is difficult for us of the West to conceive what an absolutely new idea this is to a people who through all their thousand years of history have lived under a system of State support, and it has not always been an easy matter to bring home to Orthodox folk the realization of their new responsibilities. Sometimes pressure such as that exerted in a church in Riga, is necessary to produce the proper impression. Every Russian church is over-crowded for the midnight service at Easter time. Last spring it was announced that admission to the Easter service in the church in question would be solely by ticket, and tickets were issued only to those who had been registered as supporting members of the congregation. There were many protests but the lesson went home and immediately after Easter there was a large registration of those who had hitherto been unwilling, or had not perceived the necessity of declaring themselves parishioners of any particular place. The rise of the congregational spirit in Russian Church life is going to be one of the most fascinating fields for study during the next ten years. From what has here been said the surprisingly rapid development of a workable form of Church administration will be an evidence that the Orthodox Church has an inherent capacity of adaptation to the need of new times and circumstances.

In addition to matters of church administration the Sobor passed a number of other decrees making alterations in the old order. First it restated the

Church's independence from the State in all purely ecclesiastical matters: "The Orthodox Church in Russia, in its teaching of faith and morals, Divine Service, internal church discipline and its connection with other autocephalic churches, is independent of civil authority, and.... has the right to self-determination and self-direction". For one who knew the Church under the bondage of the Synodal period, it is scarcely possible to believe the same Church is speaking in these revolutionary times. New rules were laid down for life in monasteries, making sweeping changes in internal government and discipline. The right to maintain their own bishop was accorded to the "Old-believers" the first time this had been permitted them since their legal recognition in 1800. Several sections of the published decisions of the Sobor deal with the grounds upon which the Church recognizes the right to divorce. Here again, the ancient rules are much modified and broadened. The urgent need for reform in church and theological schools was recognized and the Church Council instructed to make such changes as it should see fit. Add to this the completely new attitude taken by the Sobor toward the question of mission work and preaching, an attitude which, while it did not alter the ancient canons, still put the whole weight of higher church authority on the side of encouraging pastors to preach, instead of discouraging them as the old regime had done in every way in its power, and it will be evident why Russian Church History begins a new era with the modernizing and liberalizing Sobor.

It must here be remarked that a large part of the Sobor's legislation has gone into effect only irregularly, in accordance with local circumstances. Some decisions relate to conditions which are non-existent under the Soviet regime in Russia. Many monasteries, for instance, have been closed, while all have been greatly reduced in numbers. Rules about monasteries are

therefore of less broad application than they were originally intended to be. As the Soviet government permits no church or theological schools of any kind, decrees relating to religious education are temporarily non-applicable and the extent to which it has been possible to put the new regulations into effect has varied with the strictness or laxity of local authority. Nevertheless, this does not invalidate what has here been said. The Sobor's decrees are the commonly recognized rules for the procedure of the Orthodox Church under any system of government which accords normal rights to religious organizations.

It would not be quite fair either, to leave the impression that in these disordered times the whole reorganization of the Orthodox Church has proceeded in every part of the Russian world with undisturbed smoothness. There have been exceptions. In Pensa, for instance, a former officer of the Russian Court who had been made a bishop by the old regime was deposed by the Sobor. He refused to recognize the decree, and by virtue of his oratorical gifts for some time held parts of his congregation together in what he termed "The Independent Soviet Orthodox Church". The notorious ex-monk Iliodor, once driven from Russia, has now reappeared in Tsaritsin where he has announced himself Patriarch, and declared war against the Orthodox Church. His close alliance with the present government explains his position. He preaches that there are two divisions to the road to happiness, Communism and Christianity. His followers are told to listen to the Soviet leaders for the communist portions of the whole truth, while Iliodor promises to give them the Christian portion, himself. Such instances as these are tiny eddies in a great stream which has flowed steadily in one direction. Even in such widely separated sections of Russian Orthodoxy as the Mission in Japan, the Church of Finland, or the Orthodox portion of what once was Hungary, the new system of

church government with all its modern reform, and the authority of the Patriarch, are fully recognized. In spite of conditions of disorder and disruption quite incomprehensible to any one who has not himself been in Russia in these years, the Orthodox Church has maintained a generally ordered front as it advanced toward the new day.

Assembling as it did in the midst of such momentous circumstances in the history of the nation, the All-Russian Sobor could not well refrain from participating in national as well as ecclesiastical affairs. It could not ignore the fact that it consisted of duly elected delegates from 150 out of Russia's entire 180 million population, hence it was the most widely representative body Russia had produced. This strong sense of its national importance and duty is reflected in many of the acts of the Sobor. Aside from the numerous official communications addressed to the changing governments in regard to matters affecting faith and order generally, or the Orthodox Church in particular, we may note a more purely national feeling in such actions as the appeal to the Army in 1917 or the solemn declaration in the spring of 1918 that the Sobor, representing the vast majority of the Russian people, refused to recognize the shameful peace treaty concluded with Germany at Brest-Litovsk. Another address to all Orthodox Russians dealt with the Christian duty of citizenship as relating to the elections for the Constituent Assembly, while a telegram of congratulation addressed to King George expressed as no other body could, Russia's joy at the taking of Jerusalem by Allied Forces. The Church has not been unfaithful to its historic role in the national life of Russia.

It would be a mistake to think of the Sobor as limiting itself solely to activities within the confines of Russia. As the kinetic organ of the greatest of Eastern Churches it naturally sought the closest and

most friendly relations with all other Orthodox bodies. All the other Orthodox Churches were invited to send delegations to the Sobor and all its major decisions were immediately communicated to them. In a still wider sense the Russian Church considers itself as one member of the Church Universal, and in direct line with this feeling the Sobor appointed a special commission for cultivating close relationships with other Christian bodies. In this connection it is interesting to note the very friendly relations existing between the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church together with the Episcopal Church in America. The General Conference of the American Protestant Episcopal Church cabled its greetings to the Sobor in the summer of 1917. Later the Sobor appointed a special commission to deal with "questions relating to the Episcopal Church". To the General Conference of the Episcopal Church in America in Detroit in 1920 representatives of the American Orthodox Churches were specially invited. An indication of its relation to churches within Russia may be gathered from the letter addressed to the Sobor by Russian Lutherans in appreciation of the Church's attitude toward all government encroachment upon purely ecclesiastical matters of any creed or confession.

The Sobor adjourned in September 1918 instructing the Patriarch to call a second gathering in the spring of 1921. Its meetings had begun a new epoch in Russian church history. To the old Church it had brought renovation and reform; its capacities for self-government, stiffened by long disuse under the bondage of the Synod were rejuvenated in a new democracy. The Sobor had given the Church new visions of a future as the vehicle of ministry to and expression for a free nation. To the Orthodox people of Russia it had given a new assurance of the latent life in their Church, and of its ability to meet their changing needs. In their hearts it had fanned the flame of living

Christianity, with the Church as a means of guarding that flame. The historic shrine of Russia's religious life was renewed and preserved for a broader usefulness than anything its thousand years of history had yet witnessed. To the Russian nation the Sobor gave the assurance of the working possibility of an All-Russian democratic assembly. It provided a center of crystallization, primarily for religious thought, but in no small measure for national ideals as well. Linking the old with the new at a time when everything else was dissolving into complete chaos, it preserved the historic Church, a center for national thought and feeling, a new channel for the movement of the innate religious life of Russia.

After the decision to restore the Patriarchate, the most important act of the Sobor was the election of the man to fill that office. In the midst of the three days battle which resulted in the taking of Moskow by the Bolsheviks, the Sobor in orderly sittings carried out the routine it had defined for the election of a Patriarch. This was a minutely detailed procedure based upon the method first employed in 1634 for the election of Joasaf I and followed in the choice of all subsequent Patriarchs. A secret ballot of all members was taken and the names of those receiving votes tabulated according to the number received. The choice of the Patriarch must be made from the highest three in the list. In this case they were Tichon, Metropolitan of Moskow, Antonius, Archbishop of Charkov, and Arsenius, Archbishop of Novgorod. On November 5th, after a solemn service in the Church of the Savior, the three names, carefully sealed in wax rolls of equal size and weight, were placed in an urn and the eldest of the recluse-monks present drew out one name. It proved to be that of Tichon, whose election was forthwith proclaimed. On November 21st (1917) occurred the solemn consecration in the

Cathedral of the Assumption, and a new epoch in Russian church history had begun.

The man chosen to this high office was without question one of the most widely known and loved in all the Russian Church. He had been elected unanimously to the presidency of the Sobor. His appointment a few months earlier to the Metropolitanate of Moskow had simply indicated his prominence in Russian church affairs. The Patriarch is a native of Toropetz, a town near Pskov. His theological education was acquired in the Petrograd Academy, after which he served for three years as instructor in the Pskov Theological Seminary. In 1891 he took the monastic vow and after serving for six years as rector of the seminary in Kholm, he was consecrated Bishop of Lublin. One year later he was appointed Bishop of North America. In 1907 he returned to Russia as Bishop of Jaroslavl and in 1913 he became Bishop of Vilna, from which seat he was called four years later to the Metropolitanate of Moskow.

Patriarch Tichon's nine years in America were important ones in the affairs of the Orthodox Church there. During this period the episcopal seat was removed from San Francisco to New York. During this period Bishop Tichon became Archbishiop Tichon, the first American Orthodox hierarch to bear that title. These years made a deep impression upon the future Patriarch himself, and as will later be pointed out, the knowledge of the life and religious ideals of American people he acquired there have been very influential in later events in Russia. America has no better friend in Russia than Patriarch Tichon and he seems especially pleased to maintain his connection with Americans and things American. In view of his unique position and significance for all the Orthodox Church, a brief sketch of the Patriarch as the author last saw him in November 1920, will possibly here be pertinent.

An erect, well-built man in a black robe: grey hair and beard which at first glance make him appear older than his fifty-six years: a firm handclasp and kindly eyes with a decided trace of humor and ever a hint of fire in the back of them: those are your first impressions. That, and his beaming smile. The next thing I thought of was how little he had changed in appearance in the two years since I last visited him. He does not look a day older, and his manner, in marked contrast to so many of my friends in Moskow, is just as calm, unhurried and fearless as though he had not passed through two years of terrible uncertainty and stress. He had put on the white silk cowl with its diamond cross and the six-winged angel embroidered above the brow which is the head-dress of the Patriarch on all official occasions, but he had evidently just been sitting down to tea and the arrival of an old friend dispelled any formality. So in a minute the cope and gown had disappeared and we were sitting beside the samovar in his living room. First the Patriarch wanted to know all about the Church in America. The only recent news he had was a cablegram which had been over a year en route. Then I had to promise to convey his heartiest greetings and special blessing to a number of individuals and to "all American friends", in general.

He was most anxious to know if the letter he addressed to President Wilson on Thanksgiving Day, 1918, had ever reached him. In it the Patriarch had expressed his Church's participation in offering thanks for victory over the powers of evil, and congratulated President Wilson on his fine type of leadership. The letter then went on to speak of the seemingly severe terms imposed upon the enemy, and urged Christian forbearance and the alleviation of the conditions laid down, rather than the creation of a lasting hatred which could but breed more war. No reply was ever received, and the Patriarch was curious to know if it had ever reached the President. Later, I tried to

get a copy of this letter, but found that all extant copies had been destroyed during a political raid in the home of the Patriarch's secretary.

All those who know Patriarch Tichon enjoy his well-developed sense of humor. I believe it is this which has helped him retain his poise and cheerfulness through the past three years. I asked him how he had been treated. He told me he had been under "home arrest" for more than a year, had been permitted to go out to conduct service in other churches about once in three months, but aside from this had suffered no personal violence; this in marked contrast to many of the Church's dignitaries who had been sent to jail or even condemned to execution. "They think", the Patriarch smilingly remarked, as he patted my hand confidentially, 'O, he's an old chap: he'll die soon..... we won't bother him'. "Wait and see", he went on, shaking his finger, schoolmaster-fashion — "I'll show them, yet". And the roguish twinkle in his eyes, remarkably young in contrast to his grey hair, gave you confidence that when the present nightmare has cleared in Russia, her Church's leader will be found ready to take a most active part in the affairs of the new day.

But not a political part: we spoke of several churchmen who had dabbled in politics, and the Patriarch expressed his sorrow and disapproval. "What is right and just one may openly approve, and what is evil and unrighteous one must as openly condemn", he said, "that is the Church's business. But to meddle with the affairs of secular politics is neither the course of wisdom or of duty for a priest".

"What is the most urgent need of the Orthodox Church which the Christian world outside can supply?" I asked the Patriarch.

"Send us Bibles", he replied. "Never before in history has there been such a hunger for Scripture in the Russian people. They clamor for the

whole book — not only the Gospels but the Old Testament as well — and we have no Bibles to give them. Our slender stocks were exhausted long ago, and our presses have been confiscated, so that we cannot print more". I assured him that Christians in other lands would doubtless find a way to supply this need.

It happened to be Thanksgiving Day at home, and the Patriarch remembered, and smilingly referred to its being known as "Turkey Day" in an American family he used to visit in New York. This brought on a discussion of American and Russian holidays and this in turn led to an interesting conversation about the present religious situation in Russia. At every step in this recital the Patriarch's clear insight into men and events and his statesmanlike grasp of the affairs of the whole Church were clearly evident. I left him with a renewed conviction of his fitness for the high post he occupies.

Russian Christians believe the choice of the Patriarch was directed by Divine Providence, and surely Patriarch Tichon's career thus far, offers basis for the belief. It would be difficult to imagine a man better fitted, mentally and temperamentally for the peculiarly difficult task of leading the Orthodox Church through these years of disorder and suffering in Russia. His good-humored friendliness, combined with a kindly firmness have become proverbial in the Russian Church. This is even more true of what Russians call his "accessibility". It is common belief that anyone, be he bishop or priest or the most obscure layman, who has real need of his advice or decision, may get to see the Patriarch.

I recall a small incident which gives point to this statement. One day in 1918, late in the afternoon I called at the Patriarch's house, by appointment, for in those troubled months the Patriarch was so busy and his presence so much in demand that we used to

wonder when he found time for sleep. And as I passed through the hall I noticed a woman in a peasant's dress, sobbing in a corner. In response to my question she poured out a long story of how some canonical difficulty in the marriage of her daughter could only be solved by the personal decision of the Patriarch. "I've been here since early morning", she said, wiping her eyes, "without eating or drinking, and now they say the Patriarch is home from the Sobor but he is too busy to see me". The tall servant in the hall, who by the way was also in America with Patriarch Tichon, told me in English that he felt the Patriarch was too busy with matters of national importance to be troubled with one woman's private request. Knowing the Patriarch as I did, I ventured to tell him of the petitioner in the hall, and as I left he asked to see her. In some Russian village today there is a peasant family who think Russia's Patriarch is the kindest man who ever lived.

But these glimpses of fatherly kindness in the leader of the Russian Church must not be allowed to give a one-sided impression. On account of his good nature a Russian writer has compared him to the first Patriarch of Russia, Job. In view of his proven statesmanship and his fearless insistence upon justice as well as the remarkable skill with which he has held the Church together when everything else in Russia was falling into ruin, it seems to me he more nearly resembles Hermogen, whose influence moved so powerfully in unifying and inspiring Russian spirit to throw off the Polish yoke. From the closing of the Sobor in September, 1918, the Patriarch continued its policy of protest against increasing encroachments of civil powers upon church property and church direction. With constantly increasing severity the government punished anyone who questioned or opposed its decrees, so that to make a public protest was something which might bring the gravest personal

consequences. The policy of Red Terror had gone into effect. In the face of this, the Patriarch issued his classic Epistle to the "Soviet of People's Commissars": — "Whoso taketh a sword shall perish by the sword", it begins. "The blood of our brothers shed in rivers at your order, cries to Heaven and compels us to speak the bitter words of truth. You have given the people a stone instead of bread, a serpent instead of a fish. You have exchanged Christian love for hatred: in the place of peace you have kindled the flames of class enmity". A few lines later we read "Is this freedom, when no one may openly speak his mind without danger of being accused as a counter-revolutionary? Where is the freedom of word and press? Where is freedom of church preaching?" The epistle concludes with the formal excommunication of all those connected with the terroristic movements in the government. He is a stern man and a bold one, who can publish such sentences in the face of powerful enemies against whom he has not the slightest physical defence. The Head of the Russian Church has been absolutely fearless in condemning wrong and insisting upon justice and right.

This boldness, tempered with a well-seasoned moderation, has enabled the Patriarch to maintain his position as leader and center of the whole church organization. With clear consistence he has refrained from interference with purely political affairs, save in so far as they touched upon matters of public morals or common justice. He is probably the only man of similar importance who was able to speak his mind so freely without punishment by imprisonment or worse, during four years of the Soviet government in Russia. His life during this time has been of the greatest importance to the Russian Church. In his person all Orthodox thinking has centered. His personality has kept alive the spirit of a Church unified in a time when every other institution had gone to

pieces. His example has inspired new ideals of religion and life in the hearts of millions of his people.

Chaotic as these years have been, they have witnessed at the same time a momentous deepening of religious feeling and spirit in Russia. Religion has become in the lives of most people something far more than ever before. What once was more or less formal theory has now been transmuted by the fires of the past four years into vivid reality, into life-blood to strengthen men and women through boundless hardship. In the old days, one was often charmed by the peculiarly intimate and conscious sense of God shown by a peasant or a workman, something one finds much more rarely in western lands. Now, it is an experience to make one stop and think, to discover in the lives of the "intelligentsia", as well, exactly the same vivid certainty of God's presence and of the actuality of communion with Him. Is it something they have just learned, in these years of trial, or have they simply rediscovered the sense of God which has been latent all their lives? I think most Russians feel the latter is true, although most of the people I know frankly confess that never before has religion meant so much to them.

The Countess L. is an example of what I mean. As one knew her in the old days she was typical of her class of the "intelligentsia" in her attitude toward the church and toward religion in general: a mild respect for the feeling of other people in matters religious but a very frank scepticism, at least on the surface, so far as her own interest in religion was concerned. That was three years ago. The reign of terror and the general suffering of these years have not passed her by, and she has undergone such experiences as at once horrify you and inspire you by the heroism exhibited. Today she is a striking personality, who impresses you primarily in a religious way. It is difficult to say what it is about Countess L. which so in-

spires you, whether it is her serene faith in the goodness of God and the power of prayer, her sincere charity toward those who have caused her so much ill, or the transparently beautiful character which has grown in the midst of so much sorrow. I only know that a talk with her makes one's own faith seem so small and one's own religion so puny, that you are driven to a resolve to deepen your own spiritual life, and make it count more than ever before for the service of others.

And although the common folk of Russia have learned much in the past four years, and although many attempts to teach them have had a decidedly anti - religious color, the total new culture has not altered that depth of religious feeling which has already been mentioned. I remember riding with a woman conductor on a freight-train, in 1920, who illustrated this point. She had been telling me of the different train-loads of troops, war-prisoners and the like, it had been her fortune to help transfer. Then later we spoke of schools under the Soviet government and she expressed her chief criticism against the fact that no religious instruction was offered. "It's a bad thing for folks who lose God," she told me. "So many other people seem to have lost Him of late years. Thank Heaven we in Russia haven't. Why just last week I had a trainload of Austrian communists and some of them tried to prove to me that there is not any God at all. 'I don't want to listen to your talk', I told them, 'you don't act as though you had anything better than the old religion, and you need not talk to me against a God I know' ".

Even where common folk have been led to attempt casting off their faith together with everything else connected with the old life, the success of the assault upon religion has been only superficial. People could be harangued into a superficial acceptance of infidel doctrine, but when the matter actually came to the

test, they discovered that the old faith still remained. I know no better illustration of this than an incident in Jaroslavl in Easter week, 1919. The radicals in charge of the town, apparently moved by the notable religious feeling among the populace, called a meeting to discuss religion. Among others, representatives of the clergy were invited. Some of the best communist orators of the district were brought in to present the case against religion. First a skillful speaker discussed the "Christ myth". He explained that simple people had once been easily misled by priests into belief that Jesus was something more than a man, that He had worked miracles, had even risen from the dead. Now while Jesus deserved honor as the first Communist, He was simply a man, and an enlightened and revolutionary people should put away all their old superstitions about Him. "Long live the Communist Internationale" — and he was fairly well applauded by the people. The second speaker was a Jewess who attacked the ancient stories about the birth of Jesus. When she closed with a statement that Mary was simply a woman of the streets, and nothing more, the applause was somehow less vigorous.

Now it came the turn of the senior priest of the town to present his case. He rose, made the sign of the cross, stood a moment silently facing the crowd and then pronounced the age-old Easter greeting: "Christ is risen." Without a moment's hesitation the crowd swayed toward him in reply: "He is risen indeed". "Christ is risen", the priest repeated, and the answer came almost before he had pronounced the words. A third time he said it, with a thunderous response from the people, then, waiting a moment, he asked simply, "What more is there to say? Let us go to our homes", — and the anti-religious meeting adjourned. It is this deep-seated sense of religion in the hearts of Russian folk of all classes which has come so mightily to the front in the past four years.

Concomitant with this rise in spiritual values, there has come a notably broadened popular interest in any sort of religious instruction. Moskow, in the autumn of 1920, was placarded with posters, practically the only ones visible which were not put up by the government, announcing a series of meetings organized by the Russian Student Christian Movement, with Professor Martsenkoffsky as the chief speaker, all on purely religious themes. "The Way to New Life" and "The Coming Christ" were among other lecture topics. These meetings were held in one of the largest auditoriums in Moskow, and roused such popular interest that eventually the leaders were arrested, lest the movement turn against the government. To one returning to Russia after an absence of two years, it was astonishing to see many churches open for service every day, with a sermon at each service. In former times, a sermon was a rarity. Most congregations did not care for them, and even those priests who would have been glad to preach were under such restraint from the government that they found it very difficult. A popular lecturer on religious subjects in Petrograd some years ago once remarked that frequently priests who came to his lectures told him how they envied the freedom with which he was allowed to speak of religion. Now the whole picture is changed, people demand sermons, and sermons of the most practical character. The few specimens which have gotten into Russia of such books as Fosdick's with their very modern application of Christian teaching to every-day life, have been fairly worn out, passed from hand to hand by people eagerly seeking guidance in this new comprehension of religion. And priests have risen to meet this need, speaking truth in vigorous style, often at the risk of the gravest personal consequences. Sermons are no longer the pious, half-sentimental homilies such as one used to hear, and as are sometimes encountered today in old-fashioned

churches in Europe or America, but open, direct instruction in the duty of Christian living. One of the most striking changes in the Russian Church in the past four years is that of a clergy who practically never prepared a sermon, now metamorphosed into a body of fearless preachers of the Gospel.

This same interest in religion is again exhibited in the universal demand for Scripture. I have mentioned the Patriarch's opinion on the matter. The same situation persists everywhere. Two different women, one a lady formerly of high estate and the other a working girl, told me in Russia how they had been unable to buy a Bible. Red Army troops returning after eight months internment in Germany, begged relief agencies at the border for some bit of Scripture to take back into Russia with them. A talk with Father Hotovitsky brought out the same hunger for the Book, of which the Patriarch spoke. Three months later a British commercial agent, with no special interest in religious teaching, brought out another formal request from representatives of both the Orthodox Church and the Tolstoyan movement for assistance in procuring copies of the Bible for distribution. The fever of interest in Scripture which swept through peasant Germany at the dawn of the Reformation seems to have found a modern-day counterpart in Russia. Here however the Church, instead of attempting to suppress the spread of the Book, is the chief agency urging its use, and asking aid of foreign Bible Societies in producing the Scriptures which it cannot itself print since the confiscation of all its publishing plants. This hunger for Scripture is another indication of the new interest and meaning which religion has for all sorts of people in Russia since the Revolution.

It is also interesting to see how inevitably people connect their new-found religion with the old Church. To me this has been a new proof of the inherent vitality of Russian Orthodoxy, in this as in other times of

crisis. The churches are crowded, and the worship in them is if anything more devout than before, but one senses a new spirit of comprehension, of the practicability of faith, if the term may be applied, which was not generally present four years ago. To be sure, there may be emotional or sentimental elements in this. One woman told me: "The church is the only place where one can get away from the terrible existence we must endure". Another person, thinking along the same line, said: "O, Russia isn't Russia any more; the only place you can feel at home is in church". Be that as it may, the Church itself has made great advances in adapting itself to the newly apparent needs of its people, and religion as preached daily in its sanctuary has a new meaning for Russia.

Take the purely external alterations, for example. One of the differences from old times which immediately strikes a visitor in present-day Russia are the posters at the church door. Here is one announcing congregational singing-practice; another lists the services for the week, and you are surprised to note that there is a service with a sermon every day. Another gives notice of a special collection for a choir-director and a fourth, perhaps, appeals to all members to remain after this morning's service and help put in place the mats which are used in winter to cover the cold pavement. In the congregation the men are surprisingly predominant, many of them wearing Red Army insignia. You notice that while people are constantly entering the church, as in the old days, there are practically none leaving it, a phase of church service which was always very disconcerting to a Western visitor in a Russian church before the Revolution. Now people come and stay for the entire service, especially the sermon, an institution which in the last few months (autumn 1921) has become, except for government deliverance, the most liberal and fearless public utterance to be heard. In general, the preachers

confine themselves and their remarks pretty well within the limits set by the Patriarch in his quoted statement regarding the political activity of priests, but within these limits there has been the most vigorous speaking of the "bitter truth". The preaching priesthood has attained a new respect in the eyes of Orthodox people, through the power of the spoken word.

The anecdote I heard in Moskow about Father Hotovitsky, of the Church of the Savior is indicative of the sort of priests here mentioned. There is probably no more remarkable preacher in Russia than Father Hotovitsky. His sermons are very modern both in their theology and in their practical application. He was drawn into a discussion with Lunacharsky, Commissar of Education, on the omnipresence of God. "You say that God is everywhere", Lunacharsky told him. "Now you will surely admit that one could imagine a small box somewhere without God's being in the box". "But why suppose an imaginary box", Hotovitsky retorted, "when we have you, Mr. Commissar?"

Easter, 1921, in Moskow was another indication of the present position of the Church. The Patriarch was released from his "home arrest" to officiate at the midnight service in the Church of the Savior. But even that great temple, accomodating ten thousand people, was utterly inadequate to serve the crowd which came. The whole of the grand square about the church was flooded with worshippers and several extra services were conducted simultaneously, in the open air, to meet the exigencies of the occasion. One very significant item about this service was the insistence of the people that it should occur at midnight by sun time, instead of by the daylight-saving chronometry of the Soviet government. So while the street clocks of a Communist regime marked three-thirty a. m., the Orthodox people of Moskow celebrated a midnight service at midnight as the sun indicates time.

There is much more to be said of religious life in Russia today. These paragraphs have merely hinted at what will some day require volumes properly to outline and portray, but they will perhaps have indicated the remarkably deepened spirituality of these present times in Russia, with religion a more vital reality in the lives of all classes than ever before, with this new spiritual life manifesting itself in a keen interest in religious discussion and literature, with the old Church rising to meet the newly awakened needs of its people.

These needs present far more searching problems than merely those of organization or of church discipline. The new day in Russia demands new modes of thought, even new phases of religion. By its preaching the Church must endeavor to guide the thinking of its people as they grope their way in the dazzling light of a freedom they were as unprepared for as owls for sunshine. The Byzantine elements in religion, emphasizing the mystic in the teaching about Christ, and the less positive than negative attitude toward joyous activity, must gradually give part of their place to more modern ideas of the Christian conquest, the blessedness of Christian service, the reality of Jesus' comradeship. This is not to say that the past as a whole is to be sloughed off like an outgrown shell. Such elements as the beautiful humility which has characterized Russian Christianity for so many centuries, or the mysticism in devotion which is one of its greatest charms, must not be permitted to fade from the picture. Rather, the idea of activity, of service for a Christ who is living and loving men must be engrafted into the old stock, retaining all the beauty and usefulness of the old, but providing a combination of religious thought better fitted to meet present-day needs. These ideas must be embodied in the homiletics of the new Russia.

Such preaching you may hear in Russian churches today: sermons by Russian priests. A Westerner

would never be able to produce the desired result: he would be too brusque, too positive, too little able actually to get within the Russian religious thought of the past generations. Among American Protestants there have been numerous volunteers to go and "Christianize" Russia — they may better remain at home and preach to folk whose temperament and background they can comprehend. In Russia they would shout to unresponsive listeners. The Orthodox Church wishes every aid other Christian bodies can give it, but its preaching must be done by Russians if it is to appeal to the Russian mind.

With a rising culture in Russia, another age-old custom of Orthodoxy may come up for consideration. What will be the future of the holy pictures (ikons) of Russia? There are those who think ikons will gradually disappear from the service. If they do, it will be in the distant future. But even in these post-revolutionary years, events have often shaped themselves in a way to bring forcibly to mind the actual inconsequentiality of "holy" things and "holy" pictures. Popular feeling has revolted at cinematograph photos of the desecration of a shrine like that of Saint Sergius, but at the same time the half-unconscious impression has been made that the place or the relics are in themselves of small real worth to a Christian. The priceless treasures adorning some specially-revered ikon have been stolen and the century-old sanctity of the holy picture violated. And folk, half unknowingly, begin to take less interest in the ancient painting. It is somehow discovered to be not so efficacious as an aid to Christian living. Are these indications of the future? Perhaps, but with a custom as ancient as the usage of ikons in the Orthodox Church, alterations will be made but slowly. If the question may be called a problem at all, it is surely a secondary one. It is so unimportant in comparison with the new developments in religious thinking and comprehension that while the topic will

interest future students of Russian life, it need not further occupy us here.

There are educational problems for the Church to face, as well as theological. How shall it provide a body of clergy with a training adequate to meet the demands of its membership, especially in times like the present when church schools of all sorts are quite eliminated from the government's list of possibilities? This is one of the most immediate problems the Church has to solve. Up to now a general solution has not been discovered, the chief reliance at present being a return to the ancient custom of training young men in each church, a sort of apprentice-system for the priesthood. The ranks of the clergy have also been augmented by the ordination of many religiously minded laymen with suitable education. Although perhaps nothing better is possible just now, both of these schemes have their serious deficiences, of course, and the Church's leaders are keenly alive to the situation. The future will doubtless discover effective means to provide an adequately trained clergy.

But the Church's efforts along educational lines are not to be limited to the training of priests. The Church has gone vigorously about the task of providing a substitute for its parish schools, and organizations of various sorts among the congregations have opened religious instruction for all the church membership. Bible-study groups and something like our American mid-week prayer meetings have appeared. Preaching missions to the villages have been encouraged. The Church has given its support to other than strictly ecclesiastical movements for the spread of religious instruction.

And not purely religious education alone, has received the support of the Church. As in former times, so now it is anxious to cooperate with every worthy agency working for the general cultural uplift of Russia. The Patriarch's open letter, prepared to

accompany a rural-education expedition, is an example of the attitude of the Orthodox Church toward all sincere efforts for the well-being of Russia:

> "The Young Men's Christian Association is undertaking the support of a series of movements having for their object the improvement of the moral atmosphere of Russian life, the preaching of God's Word and, abstaining from politics, cooperation with Russian educational and economic improvement societies.
>
> "With this object in view, an expedition is proposed with a special steamer on the Volga, stopping at different villages and landings. On this boat there are to be lectures on agriculture and other topics valuable for popular education, also short religious services with appropriate moral instruction by Orthodox priests.
>
> "Sympathizing with everything which may be helpful, materially or morally, to our Russian people, we hereby confer our blessing upon the organizers of this good work, praying God's aid for its successful accomplishment.
>
> (Signed) Tichon, Patriarch of Moskow and All Russia."

The content of such an epistle evidences the remarkably modern position which this ancient Church has assumed in the face of the modern educational requirements of its people.

The widespread demand, already noted, for the Bible, indicates another line of development where the Orthodox Church has to blaze a way. Although the Church has used and taught the Gospels and the New Testament generally, until Leroy-Beaulieu could write that "the Gospels are undoubtedly the book dearest to the Russian", the old Testament has been very little known, hence the Church faces just now an interest in Scripture study quite unprecedented

in its history. And again the need evidences itself for a transition from the old mystic usage of Scripture to a vitalizing practical study, relating with ever-growing distinctness the life-giving Book to life itself.

Realizing the need for expert direction in the religious life of his Church, one of Patriarch Tichon's first official acts was to call from New York Father Hotovitsky who for some years in America had been specializing on church organization, young people's work and the like. As early as the autumn of 1918 parish organizations similar to the "Brotherhoods" in many American churches, had begun to make their appearance. They were followed by women's organizations with the object of Bible study as well as assistance in church maintenance. Children's, particularly boys' groups, have been formed, until today in Russia thousands of congregations have one or more organized clubs of women, men or young people, existing for self-help in religious and moral education, and for helping others along the same lines. The preaching missions already mentioned, which from time to time have gone from city centers out into the villages, have been another evidence of the Church's capacity to cope with this need for a more general education in practical religion.

Surely the history of the Church since the revolution offers a guarantee for its future place in the life of the Russian people. During times when all other phases of national life and organization were dissolved in a national disorder such as no other country of modern times has experienced, merely to have held itself together in unbroken unity would have been a performance worthy the world's notice. This the Church has done, but beyond that it has succeeded, in the face of all the forces striving for its dissolution, in building for itself a new form of organization and government, with principles of democratic control such as it had never known before. In the Patriarchate, which as has been seen is not a restoration of the old

autocracy or a centralization of authority in one person, the Church has found for itself a new center around which it has crystallized a firm unity.

In establishing the principle of conciliar management, with democratic legislative bodies representing all classes of the people, men and women, clergy and lay, it has provided a form of government which harmonizes with the best progressive spirit of the Russian world. The Church has remodelled its administration to meet the new situation.

It has revised its services as well, so that now as never before the services in its sanctuaries are not merely for the people, but of the people. The new economic conditions have helped to bring each communicant into a position of participation in the affairs of his parish. The management of parish business by a committee chosen by the people has given them a new sense of responsibility for their Church. The introduction of congregational singing and the entirely new emphasis upon preaching brings worship into a new phase of actual commonality. All the people are participants in the services, and these services are so ordered as to meet the marvellously new interest in practical religion which exists throughout Russia today.

These changes the Church has made in itself in order to minister to the new needs of the Russian people are simply what might have been expected in the light of its historic past. When Christianity first dawned in Russia, it was the Church which spread the light of learning and the acceptance of Christian morality throughout the land. When much of the old order was dissolved in the two hundred years Russia bowed beneath the Tatar yoke it was the Church again which offered a rallying point and actually inspired the effort which threw off the Asiatic tyranny. It was the Church under Hermogen, in the "Troublous Times", which kept alive the spark of patriotism,

for Russians always linked in an indissoluble way with the idea of Orthodoxy, and the glorious defence of the Sergievskaya Lavra marked a new turning point in Russian national affairs, with the Church in the leader's role. In the light of the Church's glorious past, when in every time of national crisis it has somehow maintained not only its own unity, but has been the center around which the spirit of the nation could rally, is it unduly optimistic to suggest that in our day we are witnessing another repetition of history? Surely the events of the past five years, with the Church as the only organization which still exists, standing like a temple miraculously preserved amid a city devastated by fire, offer ground for the belief that the Church in Russia will not belie its past performances. It is not only preserved amidst general ruin, but it has purged itself of the evils which a time of servitude had fastened upon it, remodelled its forms of government and worship, and ministers today to the needs of Russian people with a completeness it has never before known.

And if the history of the past offers bright hope for the future of the Orthodox Church, just as truly does the personality of the men who are guiding its affairs in the present. What has been said of the liberality and breadth of mind of the Patriarch, of his keen appreciation of the needs of Russian Christianity today and the measures the Church must take to meet them, is typical of the church leaders who form his immediate circle of advisers. It is no exaggeration to say that the most able and the most liberal men in the Orthodox Church are guiding its present efforts. Perhaps the fact is significant that many of them, like Patriarch Tichon himself, have spent some years in America, where acquaintance has been gained with Western religious ideals and practice. Father Hotovitsky using his knowledge of young people's organizations in America to build up throughout

the Russian Church similar groups, or Bishop Anatolii of Tomsk who even before the assembly of the Sobor began parochial organizations modelled after those he had known in America, are outstanding examples of the progressive leadership in the Orthodox Church today. Besides forming one of the strongest possible ties of friendship with America, these men by the very fact of their acquaintance with life in our country are bound to be of most valuable service in bringing the Russian Church up to the new and lofty standards she has set for herself. Their background of acquaintance with Western ideals of religion is likely to be of large influence in the progress of the Church of Russia.

As these men go forward in the work of leading Russian Christianity out along lines of freer activity and more vital religion, they are looking to the Christians of other lands for support and assistance. It would be difficult to imagine an organization more truly desirous of learning from the best in others, of profiting by experience along the same paths it has laid out for itself, than is the Russian Church. It confidently expects that Christians of other nations will gladly offer whatever assistance is within their power. What contributions can members of other Christian confessions make toward the progress of Christianity in Russia?

To be of service to the Church of Russia, Christians of the West must first cultivate acquaintance with it. A study of its ideals and its history, a genuine effort to appreciate all that is valuable in its past and present — these must first lead us to a sincere recognition of the breadth and depth of Russian Christianity. Study its literature; if possible become familiar with its service. There are many Russian churches in America where one may begin this helpful acquaintance and any sincerely friendly approach will be met with equal friendliness.

Practical aid may be extended in the provision of books. The whole realm of our modern religious

literature may be opened to Russia: educational courses for use in church schools and organized Bible-study groups will be eagerly utilized. Such books as homiletical aids, guild and society handbooks, would be most useful if translated and adapted to modern Russian conditions. The best religious thought of the modern West should be put at Russia's disposal by translation and publication in Russian. In the interval until the Church is again in a position to publish the Bible and portions of it for itself, the other Christian communions will find it difficult to turn a deaf ear to the appeals of both the Church and the Russian people for copies of the Word of God. Cooperation should be encouraged along all lines of religious endeavor and all our own experience in religious organization and method should be open for the use of the Russian Church. They seek our aid, and we must not withhold it.

Any such assistance offered to Russia by Western Christianity will be welcomed with open arms, and if the suggestions here contained are borne in mind there will be no possibility for misunderstanding. Once a thorough appreciation of the essential "Russianity" of the Orthodox Church is established, there will be no misguided efforts to help Russian Christianity through the propagation of other forms of church organization or sectarian propaganda. What Western Christianity gives to Russia must be given through the Orthodox Church and not in any sort of opposition to or competition with it. A church which regardless of the barriers of distance and language, has prayed daily for a thousand years for "the welfare of God's churches and the union of them all" will welcome every sincerely friendly approach from other Christian bodies.

In all this talk of efforts toward the rapprochement of other Christian bodies to the Russian Church, and methods of extending aid in these trying years, one possibility overtops all the rest. We must cultivate ac-

quaintance with the Orthodox Church and personal contact with its leaders. We must learn to appreciate the beauty and value in its worship and its teaching. We must realize that the Russian Church is essentially indigenous and adapt to that cardinal fact our efforts at effective assistance. We should put at its disposal the best of our modern religious thought in the form of books and periodicals. These are particularly vital for those Americans who go to Russia or who are directing the home churches. To all Christians at home, however, there remains the privilege of all Christians everywhere, that of intercession. It is doubtful if anywhere in the Christian world today there is a more vital belief in the value of prayer, than in Russia. When the Russian Church asks for our prayers, the request is more than an empty formality. Russia believes, she knows from experience, how the power of God may be invoked, and her people confidently expect the prayer support of Christians of other lands. In the midst of the terrible uncertainty of the summer of 1918, when no one dared plan anything more than a few days in advance, and even the Sobor carried on its orderly deliberations only in the face of unbelievable hindrances, the proclamation of President Wilson appointing "a day of humiliation, prayer and fasting" made a deep impression upon the leaders of the Russian Church. The feeling of the Patriarch is evident in his letter, written at that time, to his friend Dr. Mott, as one of the leaders among the Christian forces of America:

> "It was with especial sympathy that we together with all believing Russians heard that the members of the churches of God in America had been assembled by your President and church leaders in the houses of God Memorial Day to fast and pray for peace among the nations at war. We also recall with deep gratitude the friendly feelings repeatedly expressed by your President toward Russia.

"It would comfort us to know that the Christians of America will continue to remember our Russian Church and people in their prayers. We would feel deeply grateful if you could express to the Christian people in America our profound desire for their intercession, especially at this crisis in Russia. We are conscious in this dark hour that the moral support and prayers of all Christendom are vital for the rebuilding of Russia through Christ to her former strength".

The head of Russia's Church is here expressing the feeling of most of its leaders and millions of its people. Such a letter brings an almost irresistible appeal. As the old Church of Russia moves out into new fields of service for a people rising to the ideals of a modern world, may Christians of the West be not unmindful of this desire for their prayer-support. Joining in its age-old prayer for the welfare of all God's churches, may we open our thought to every means of cooperation and assistance for the Church of Russia.

DATE DUE

APR 1 1988

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

281.947
L921

Lowrie, Donald Alexander.
AUTHOR

The light of Russia.
TITLE

281.947
L921 Lowrie, Donald Alexander.
The light of Russia.

48261